BOARD OF EDITORS

ARTHUR E. R. BOAK — J. FRED RIPPY
DUMAS MALONE — CHARLES SEYMOUR
NELLIE NEILSON — PRESERVED SMITH

AND

HENRY E. BOURNE
Managing Editor

Editorial Assistant
ELEANOR D. SMITH

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

BOOKS OF ANCIENT AND MEDIEVAL HISTORY

PAGE

Lovejoy, *et al.*, *History of Primitivism*, I, by R. K. Hack ... 728
Regout, *Doctrine de la guerre juste*, by Quincy Wright ... 730
Lot, *et al.*, *Histoire du Moyen Age*, I, pt. 4, by Einar Joranson ... 732
Murray, *Constitutional History of the Cinque Ports*, by B. H. Putnam ... 734
Lobel, *Borough of Bury St. Edmund's*, by Carl Stephenson ... 735

BOOKS OF MODERN HISTORY

Vander Linden, *Hégémonie européenne*, by Roger B. Merriman ... 736
Wolf, *Science, Technology, and Philosophy, 16th and 17th Centuries*, by Bert James Loewenberg ... 738
Higgs, *Bibliography of Economics, 1751–1775*, by E. L. Bogart ... 739
Parkinson, *Edward Pellew*, by William Thomas Morgan ... 740
Schapiro, *Condorcet and the Rise of Liberalism*, by Crane Brinton ... 742
Caron, *Massacres de Septembre*, by Henry E. Bourne ... 743
Phipps, *Armies of the First French Republic*, IV, by Tryon S. Anderson ... 745
Knapland, *Gladstone's Foreign Policy*, by Walter Phelps Hall ... 746
Gooch, *Before the War*, I, by Bernadotte E. Schmitt ... 748
Gooch, Temperley, *British Documents*, IX, pt. 2, by Sidney B. Fay ... 751
Hoetzsch, *Dokumente aus den Archiven der Zarischen Regierung*, VI, VII, VIII, pt. 1, by Harry R. Rudin ... 753
Almond, Lutz, *Treaty of St. Germain*, by Robert C. Binkley ... 757
Willoughby, *The Sino-Japanese Controversy and the League*, by C. Walter Young ... 759

BOOKS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

Malone, *Dictionary of American Biography*, XVII-XVIII, by A. M. Schlesinger ... 761
Craven, *Essays in Honor of William E. Dodd*, by Thomas Perkins Abernethy ... 763
Kingsbury, *Records of the Virginia Company of London*, IV, by W. F. Craven ... 764
Morris, *Select Cases of the Mayor's Court of New York City*, by R. Coulton, Jr. ... 766
Bemis, *Foundations of American Diplomacy*, I, by Edward S. Corwin ... 769
Bemis, Griffin, *Guide to the Diplomatic History of the United States*, by Hunter Miller ... 771
Anderson, *Command of the Howe Brothers*, by Allen Bogue ... 773
Weinberg, *Manifest Destiny*, by Louis Martin Sears ... 776
Miller, *Treaties and Other International Acts*, IV, by Samuel Flagg Bemis ... 777

(List of Subjects of Books Contained in the Fifth Group Omitted)

The American Historical Association supplies the Review to all its members; the Council of the Association elects members of the Board of Editors.

Subscriptions should be sent to The Macmillan Company, Publishers, Brunswick Street, Richmond, Va., or 60 Fifth Avenue, New York. The price is $5.00 [illegible] single numbers are sold for $1.50 (back numbers at the subscription rate [illegible] $7.50.

Correspondence in regard to contributions to the Review should be addressed to the Managing Editor, Robert L. Schuyler, 535 W. 114th Street, New York City. [illegible] should be sent to the same address.

COPYRIGHT, 1936, BY THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

Volume XLI] *July, 1936* [*Number 4*

The

American Historical Review

THE HOMESTEAD ACT AND THE LABOR SURPLUS[1]

EVERY American historian and all students of Western history are well acquainted with the declaration of the Superintendent of the Eleventh Census of the United States that by 1890 "the unsettled area [of the United States] has been so broken into by isolated bodies of settlement that there can hardly be said to be a frontier line".[2] The reader of these words need not become prematurely alarmed—it is not the purpose of this paper either to amplify or attack the Turner hypothesis. Only some of the later perversions of the frontier philosophy will be considered. The Superintendent of the Census was very cautious in the phraseology of his statement, and Professor Turner, in his original essay, did not attempt to read more into the sentence than its literal meaning conveyed. But long repetition, without frequent reference to the original text, plays tricks with the memory. Within a few years students were being told that by 1890 the frontier was gone, next that by 1890 the West was filled up with settlers, and finally that by 1890 all the free land in the West had been homesteaded. Since 1920 a fair proportion of the college textbooks in American history have contained such exaggerated statements as these in one form or another. Three out of five picked off the same shelf repeated the dogma in varying style. The pronounce-

[1] This paper was first read at a meeting of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association at Cincinnati, on Apr. 26, 1935. Since then Professor Carter Goodrich and Mr. Sol Davison have published two articles on "The Wage-Earner in the Westward Movement", in the *Political Science Quarterly*, L (June, 1935), 161-185; LI (Mar., 1936), 61-116, in which substantially the same conclusions were reached as are set forth here. These studies—theirs and my own—having been made independently, but based upon different evidence and following different procedures, tend rather to corroborate than to duplicate each other. Another article entitled "A Critical Analysis of the Safety Valve Idea in American History with Particular Reference to the Period Centering around the Depression of 1837", written by Murray Kane and as yet unpublished, shows the weakness of the theory at a very early period of American industrialism.

[2] This statement, as repeated by Frederick Jackson Turner, has been printed in various places, but can most conveniently be found in his *Frontier in American History* (New York, 1920), p. 1.

ments are so readily found that there is no need to make any embarrassing commitments concerning the authors or titles of the books examined.

Easy as it is to record such misinformation, culminating in the absurdity that the Homestead Act of 1862 wrought this miracle in the West, a half hour spent with the Land Office reports or the Public Lands Commission report of 1905 will reveal the error. By June 30, 1890, only 372,659 homestead entries had been perfected, granting 48,225,736 acres to supposed settlers—an area less than that of the state of Nebraska and equal only to three and one half per cent of the total territory west of the Mississippi River.[3] By that date more than four times as much land had been given to the railroad companies. Furthermore, four times as many acres of homestead land have been deeded by the Federal government since 1890 as before that date. For that matter, more has been taken up since 1910 than in all the earlier forty-eight years.[4] To the contention that only inferior lands were left for free distribution after 1890 the answer is that most of the choice land in the country (land suited for general agriculture, and having sufficient rainfall to ensure crops) had been picked over before the Homestead Act was passed; and that, in the semiarid regions where most of the free land was to be found, the first comers were far from always being the best choosers.

A more valid objection is that the number of homesteads was only a minor fraction of the total number of farms in the homestead states. But even this does not demonstrate that the West was filled up by 1890, or that the opportunity to go West and grow up with the country was past. A little comparison will illustrate this point better than a mass of figures. In 1890 little Delaware, with, as John J. Ingalls said, three counties at low tide and two at high, had half again as many farms as Idaho or Montana, three times as many as Wyoming, seven times as many as Arizona, or eight times as many as Nevada. Maryland had more farms than any of the eleven Far Western states or territories except California, and was not far behind her. Mississippi had as many farms as the whole eleven combined, though the latter contained two fifths of the land area

[3] "Report of the Public Lands Commission", 1905, *Senate Document*, 58 Cong., 3 sess., no. 189, p. 175. Proved up homesteads equaled 75,353 square miles as compared with 2,145,313 in the trans-Mississippi West or 77,520 in Nebraska.

[4] To 1910 inclusive 118,922,354 acres had been deeded to settlers. By 1933 the figure had grown to 237,099,586, and, though the rate was falling off, nearly a million acres were patented in the latter year. The largest number of acres patented in any one year was 10,009,285 in 1912-1913. *Statistical Abstract of the United States*, 1934, no. 56, p. 126.

of the nation, and Ohio had nearly twice as many. But perhaps Western farms were larger than Eastern. Very well—Ohio had about half as many acres in farms as the entire Far West, and a larger percentage of Ohio's land was improved. Delaware equaled the average of Arizona, Idaho, New Mexico, and Utah, and was only a little under Wyoming, Montana, or Nevada.[5]

No further demonstration is necessary to show that the filling up of the West had merely begun by 1890. There is an old saying that figures do not lie, but liars will figure. This is no more true than that armchair philosophers still continue to spin hypotheses out of thin air. Oftentimes their formulas, evolved sheerly by guesswork, become more firmly established in the student's mind than any solidly grounded historical fact. A writer, proceeding from the old assumption that free land was gone by 1890, next conjures up the fiction that as long as abundant free land remained it furnished relief from economic pressure in the industrial centers; that it drained off the dissatisfied and restless elements from the Eastern cities; that it gave to the underdog, wherever located in the country, the opportunity to start life on a new and higher level in the West; that free or cheap land had always been a safety valve for economic and social discontent.[6] It would almost seem, from such logic, that if there was any social discontent, any underdog, any labor trouble or unemployment before 1890 it was due purely to the shiftlessness of a portion of the population which would not even accept the heaven-sent boon of fertile farms when it was offered them. The next conclusion is that all the labor troubles since 1890 were the consequence of the drying up of the national fount of every blessing in the West. The hypotheses and conclusions here mentioned were gleaned from books which college students by the thousands have been required to read within the last decade. The writers selected were from the foremost and best in their field, in order to show the more clearly how strong a hold the idea of limitless opportunity, furnished by a boundless frontier, has had on the popular mind. Certain facts, not difficult to demonstrate, call for a re-

[5] *Eleventh Census*, 1890, "Statistics of Agriculture", pp. 84, 92, 100.

[6] There is more than a suspicion of this sort of reasoning in some of Turner's own later writings. In 1903, ten years after his original essay, he wrote: "Men would not accept inferior wages and a permanent position of social subordination when this promised land of freedom and equality was theirs for the taking. . . . In a word, then, free lands meant free opportunities", *op. cit.*, pp. 259-260. Again, in 1910, while discussing the subject of class stratification, he asserted that "the sanative influences of the free spaces of the West were destined to ameliorate labor's condition . . . and to postpone the problem", *ibid.*, p. 275.

examination of this thesis, but the argument must be more prolonged than that of the preceding paragraphs.

The notion of an American Utopia, to be procured through free land in limited quantities to actual settlers, dates back a century or more, but found its most profound expression in the pious hopes of the land reformers of the 1840's. George Henry Evans and his fellow agrarians, writing for the columns of the *Working Man's Advocate,* the *True Workingman,* the New York *Daily Tribune,* and other labor or general newspapers, harped incessantly on the issues of widespread misery, poverty, and unemployment as a consequence of capitalism and land monopolies. All this they confidently expected to be remedied by a homestead policy which would give land to all who could use it. Eighty thousand persons in the city of New York alone, or a fifth of its population in 1845, it was asserted, were "receiving pauper relief or charity".[7] Newly arrived immigrants were adding to the congested Eastern slums because, all the land within easy reach being monopolized, they were left with no prospect of relief except to "move off into the desert, and trust . . . [themselves] to the mercy of the wild Indian far beyond the aid of civilized man". The laborer, when he had a job at all, was pictured dragging out his weary existence and leaving to his family the heritage of poverty—the privilege of continued exploitation at the hands of capitalists and land monopolists. Break down the "hoary iniquities of Norman land pirates" and "Capital could no longer grasp the largest share of the laborer's earnings, as a reward for not doing him all the injury the laws of feudal aristocracy authorize . . .". Give the people their right to the soil and "tens of thousands, who are now languishing in hopeless poverty, will find a certain and speedy independence. The labor market will thus be eased of the present distressing competition; and those who remain, as well as those who emigrate, will have the opportunity of realizing a comfortable living." [8]

These agrarians were not timid about accusing the abolitionists of callous disregard concerning the fate of Northern wage slaves, both white and black, whose plight, they said, made that of the Southern slave seem idyllic by comparison. Gerrit Smith was accused of condemning 50,000 laborers to "a worse state of ignorance, degradation, misery, and vice, than any fifty thousand you could pick out in a Southern State", because of his withholding from them his vast New York

[7] John R. Commons and others, editors, *Documentary History of American Industrial Society* (11 vols., Cleveland, 1910-1911), VIII, 32 ff.

[8] *Ibid.,* VII, 299, 301, 302, 306-307.

estates—an indictment which helped induce him to give away about 200,000 acres to the poor of both races.[9] Further arguments contained the prophecy that the steam engine, existing power machinery on the farm, and machines yet to come in all lines of industry would virtually replace human labor everywhere.[10] All this debate, and much more to the same point, took place after the adoption of the general Pre-emption Act—when all the oppressed laborer had to do was to move out to the public domain, start farming, and accumulate the minimum price of $100 for eighty acres before the surveyor and land office moved in. But where was this semipauper to secure the cost of transportation for the journey of several hundred miles; who would buy him a team and farming equipment when he arrived, who extend him credit during the two- or three-years' grubbing of stumps before a decent living could be secured? Who would take the trouble even to teach him the elements of frontier farming? Having once been caught in the toils of poverty and hired labor, free will was at an end. Farmers might sell their Eastern acres and move West, and so they did in order to provide farms for each of their sons, but the promise of cheap Western land to the common laborer was as futile as a signboard pointing to the end of a rainbow.

But possibly these agrarian agitators imagined most of the poverty and unemployment of the 1840's. If you think so, then read the debates in Congress over the Homestead bill of 1852. Representatives from the South and Northwest alike demanded that the homeless, destitute, and downtrodden, whether in Eastern cities or on tenant farms in the South, be given the opportunity to start life anew on the public domain. Andrew Johnson of Tennessee pleaded for the poverty-stricken people of the South, while Representative Fayette McMullin of Virginia gloated over the prospect of the landed proprietors of his state being compelled to "go to work themselves" should the poor tenants be drawn away to the West. The latter denounced the Eastern manufacturing interests who were blocking the Homestead bill, declaring that they "fear that the laborers . . . will leave the manufacturing districts and go to the West, and that, in consequence of the diminution of laborers, the wages of labor will advance among them". Representative Albert G. Brown of Mississippi deplored the fate of thousands of homeless people who "look out upon your vast domains, and see them tenanted only by wild beasts . . . ". These persons, he said, "will ask, is my poverty so great

[9] *Ibid.*, p. 354. See also pp. 352-362, *passim*, and VIII, 24. For Smith's land donations, see Octavius Brooks Frothingham, *Gerrit Smith* (New York, 1878), pp. 102-112.

[10] Commons, VII, 302-304.

a crime that my Government prefers these beasts to me? Am I to be kept in penury and in want, and leave to my children no inheritance but poverty, whilst my Government guards . . . this mighty wilderness, which God in his providence has created for man, and not for beasts?" He realized that the prospective free territories would get the first advantage of settlement, but, having been a squatter himself in his early days, he felt that the release of human misery in the South was worth the political advantage of the North. Representative William R. Smith of Alabama affirmed it to be "the duty of Congress to help the cities to disgorge their cellars and their garrets of a starving, haggard, and useless population". But he cherished the vain hope that capitalists would advance the money to enable poor men to move to the free land. They would be glad to get rid of undesirable neighbors. Without this safety valve, the "rapid *increase of labor-saving machinery*", which was gradually driving the mechanic from the workshop, would create intolerable conditions.[11]

The statements thus far are all from Southerners—those persons who are supposed to have been most bitter against homestead legislation. If an aside is permissible, it is worth the effort to state that it was a division of votes between the Atlantic Coast states and the West, rather than between the slave and free states, which defeated the Homestead bills of 1852-1853. In the House vote of May 12, 1852, 36 slave state representatives (31 being from the West) voted for the bill as compared with 33 against (28 of them from the Atlantic states). Seventeen of the 23 negative votes of the North were from the Atlantic states, five from Ohio which industrially was becoming an Eastern state, and one from Michigan.[12] Had the 36 homestead advocates of the South reversed their position and joined with the 22 opposition votes from the industrial states, the bill would not even have passed the House of Representatives, despite the large Northern majority in that body. The decisive vote did not come in the Senate till February 21, 1853, when a motion to take up the bill was made with the express intention of showing who was for it and who against. This motion was defeated by a vote of 23 to 33.[13] An analysis of the vote shows that eight of the 23 favoring the measure were from the Lower South, but only four were from the North Atlantic

[11] *Cong. Globe*, 32 Cong., 1 sess., app., pp. 511, 512, 514-516 (italics in original), 519, 530.

[12] *Ibid.*, pt. 2, p. 1351, for the House vote. The total was 107 yeas and 56 nays. Fifty of the negative votes were from the Atlantic Coast states and industrial Ohio. The affirmative vote of the North showed 37 from the East and 34 from the West (Ohio's rural vote included).

[13] *Ibid.*, 32 Cong., 2 sess., pp. 739-747. Vote on p. 747.

division. As to party support, 19 were Democrats and four were Whigs. Of the 33 opponents, 20 were from the slave states and 11 from the North Atlantic region. The party division showed 15 Democrats and 18 Whigs. But consider the vote again as an issue between the Atlantic Coast states and the West—leaving North and South, slavery and freedom out of the question—and what is the result? The East gave five yeas and 24 nays; the West 18 yeas and nine nays. Most clearly, the issue in 1852-1853 was drawn between Western Democratic homestead advocates and Eastern Whig capitalists. These were the days when Hannibal Hamlin, the later running mate of Abraham Lincoln, and Gerrit Smith, the abolitionist, free-soil capitalist, were voting to restrain the Westward migration of wage slaves,[14] while a good proportion of earnest Southerners were ready to give the North an advantage in Western colonization in order to relieve poverty in both sections. It was only when the Republican party became militant over the free-soil question that the South consolidated its ranks against the homestead policy.[15]

If it be supposed that the Southern arguments of 1852 were merely to save the face of slavery men, by depicting conditions in the North, then read the declarations of free-state men of the same period. Representative Charles Skelton of New Jersey said that the Homestead bill "relieves the older States of the redundancy of labor which contributes to depress and paralyze the arm of industry in those States". The plight of landless and jobless free Negroes in the North is depicted in the words of Representative Samuel W. Parker of Indiana. "Go into the streets of our cities", he said, "through the lanes and highways, the filthy hovels, damp cellars, and dirty sculleries of our own free land, and we will find that poor, forlorn, outcast, downtrodden, disfranchised people still enslaved, and in a desperate thraldom, that would freeze our pure Christian blood, I fear, could we only extract some of the motes from our eyes".[16]

Through nearly all these orations and prophecies there runs the con-

[14] For Hamlin's vote in 1853, see *ibid.*, p. 747. His thorough denunciation of the Homestead bill is in the Appendix, 33 Cong., 1 sess., p. 1103. For Gerrit Smith's vote in 1854, see *ibid.*, pt. 1, p. 549.

[15] Some of the later significant votes on homestead bills may be found in the *Cong. Globe*, 33 Cong., 1 sess., pt. 1, p. 549, for House vote of Mar. 6, 1854 (see p. 2 for state and party affiliations of members); *ibid.*, pt. 3, p. 1844, for Senate vote to substitute the Graduation bill for the Homestead bill; *ibid.*, 35 Cong., 1 sess., pt. 3, p. 2426, for Senate vote on May 27, 1858, to postpone action on a homestead bill (Andrew Johnson voting "yea" in order to secure reconsideration; see also *ibid.*, 35 Cong., 2 sess., pt. 2, p. 1074, for explanation of the significance of this vote); *ibid.*, pp. 1075, 1076, for Senate votes of Feb. 17, 1859. The legislative history of the bill in 1860-1862 is common knowledge.

[16] *Cong. Globe*, 32 Cong., 1 sess., app., pp. 380, 509.

fident expectation that free land in the West would of itself alone furnish release from the oppression of poor laborers, tenants, and the unemployed. This is the theme, later blindly accepted as an accomplished fact, that is found in so many of the accounts of the consequences of the Homestead Act of 1862. A more reasonable point of view is reflected in the speech of Representative Orlando B. Ficklin of Illinois, April 24, 1852. Though he favored the Homestead bill, he argued that there would be no sudden or excessive rush to the public lands. Those persons able to buy would prefer to remain closer to the old home and the greater conveniences of a developed country. Another class, he said, "are too poor to find means to pay the expense of emigrating from the older to the new States, and of settling on these lands; therefore those persons can not go". The actual settlers "will be generally of the middle, or rather not of the very poorest class, and . . . the number will not be so large by a great deal as is anticipated by some gentlemen".[17] Here is the sanest prophecy of the whole crop of the 1840's and 1850's.

The trouble with the Homestead Act in operation, as with the Preemption Act, was that Congress merely adopted the law and then did absolutely nothing in the way of helping the needy persons out to the land or extending them credit and guidance in the first heartbreaking years of occupancy. Perhaps these functions were outside the scope of Federal authority, at least as then conceived, but without them the Homestead Act could benefit only monopolists or persons of fairly ample means.[18] The Graduation Act of 1854, disposing of hitherto unsalable land in the older states at prices as low as twelve and one half cents an acre, had helped nobody but neighboring farmers and speculators.[19] Now that free land was provided, the results were not widely different. If the families of all persons making good on homesteads before 1890 had averaged five each, a population of considerably less than 2,000,000 would have been provided for. But so many families spread out over several homesteads that it would be injudicious to assume so large an average family for each farm. A population increase of 30,000,000 in thirty years failed to be benefited in any way by free land.

The bulk of these persons was added to the urban population, to be absorbed by industry or swell the ranks of the unemployed and

[17] *Ibid.*, p. 523; also in pt. 2, p. 1183.

[18] See Robert Tudor Hill, *The Public Domain and Democracy* (Columbia University Studies in History, Economics and Public Law, vol. XXXVIII, no. 1, New York, 1910), pp. 45 ff.

[19] See [U. S.] General Land Office *Report*, 1860, pp. 32, 48; Thomas Donaldson, *The Public Domain* (Washington, 1884), p. 291.

destitute. Most of them were not even within yearning distance of the public domain. Of the twenty-nine states ultimately to exist in the regions where the public land lay in 1862, only eight were east of the Mississippi River, and three of these (Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois) were able to provide only 208 farms in forty-two years. Three others were Gulf states, which did not attract settlers from the industrial centers.[20] Michigan and Wisconsin were, therefore, the only states east of the Mississippi which could entice farmers and laborers from the congested regions. Before the industrial worker could even consider applying for a homestead he had to figure where, if possible, he was to raise the money to transport himself, and probably a family, from 500 to 1000 miles to the new Canaan. This in itself might be the equivalent of six months' wages; and many times as much more was necessary if he made a success of his venture as a frontier farmer. Even the landowner who sold out in the East and transplanted himself on a homestead was more likely than not to find himself wandering forty years in the wilderness before reaching Canaan. Hardly more than a third of the homesteaders in the years before 1890 remained long enough to perfect their claims.[21] It was hard enough for an experienced farmer to make a success of the venture. To the industrial laborer of the second generation it was virtually an impossibility.

Down to 1860, even when the illegal squatter dominated the frontier, it was the unusual thing, rather than the customary, for the pioneer to make his ultimate home farther than one state removed from that of his birth. Even the California gold rush, the Oregon Trail, and the mining stampedes of the late 1850's do not invalidate this statement. "In thirty States out of thirty-four", said the Superintendent of the Census in 1860, "it will be perceived that *the native emigrants have chiefly preferred to locate in a State immediately adjacent to that of their birth;* and in the four cases of exception, the persons removing have proceeded from Maine to Massachusetts, from Maryland to Ohio, from Mississippi to Texas, and from Missouri to California. The second preference, in a majority of cases, has been to another adjoining State." The population of Kansas, with all due deference to the Emigrant Aid societies, came

[20] These were Mississippi, Alabama, and Florida. General Land Office *Report*, 1860, p. 9; *Sen. Doc.*, 58 Cong., 3 sess., no. 189, p. 175. The small portions of Louisiana and Minnesota lying east of the Mississippi River are scarcely enough to include those states in the list.

[21] By 1880 there were 162,237 final entries as compared with 469,782 original filings, Donaldson, p. 355. The figures for 1883 are given as 213,486 and 608,677 in Frederic L. Paxson, *History of the American Frontier* (Boston, 1924), p. 549.

chiefly from Missouri, Illinois, and Iowa.[22] The trend was not greatly different during the next twenty years. Half of the final homestead entries to 1890 were in Minnesota, Kansas, and Nebraska. Wisconsin, Michigan, Arkansas, Missouri, Iowa, California, and Dakota Territory accounted for three fourths of the rest.[23] Again, it was the territory closest to the older states which received the emigrants. And from what regions and walks of life did the pioneers come? According to the United States Industrial Commission, investigating the situation at the close of the century, they were generally native Americans from the Eastern and Southern states, "who have sold their small farms in order to buy large ones in a new section", so that the parents could "leave a farm to each child".[24] The movement was from the farm to the farm, or, as will be shown later, from the farm to the city. Rarely was it from the city to the farm—from the laborer's hut to the homestead.

Professor Gates shows in the companion article how easily speculators acquired great tracts of land in the period since 1862.[25] The evidence of their activities in monopolizing the public domain is abundant. The Public Land Commission reported that "The land laws, decisions, and practices have become so complicated that the settler is at a marked disadvantage in comparison with the shrewd business man who aims to acquire large properties". A premium was put on perjury. ". . . In very many localities, and perhaps in general, a larger proportion of the public land is passing into the hands of speculators and corporations than into those of actual settlers who are making homes". And again comes the statement: "Nearly everywhere the large landowner has succeeded in monopolizing the best tracts, whether of timber or agricultural land." Some objections were being raised, but there was no general outcry. The influential persons whose complaints might have been heard were among the beneficiaries. The result was that a tenant or hired labor system was taking the place of freehold farmers.[26] The usual practice in North Dakota, said the Industrial Commission, was for settlers to mortgage their farms to the limit and then let the loan companies take them. This may be regarded as typical of the West in general. The speculators formed syndicates to induce Easterners to take up Western land. But the alien element of the urban centers was avoided. "The

[22] *Eighth Census*, "Population", pp. xxxiv, xxxv. The italics are in the original.

[23] Donaldson, p. 355.

[24] *Report*, XIX, 120.

[25] Various other related matters which are merely alluded to or ignored entirely here are discussed in detail by Professor Gates. No attempt has been made to eliminate the occasional small items of duplication of subject matter.

[26] *Sen. Doc.*, 58 Cong., 3 sess., no. 189, pp. xxiii-xxiv.

surplus population of Eastern cities is considered to be lazy and generally not fit for colonization purposes after they have once had a taste of city life." [27]

This practice was made worse by the amendment of 1891 which permitted settlers to commute their claims by a money payment after fourteen months of nominal or eight months of actual residence.[28] Between 1882 and 1904 nearly 139,000 settlers commuted homesteads comprising 20,000,000 acres. In some years nearly two thirds of the deeds were secured by commutation, and one third of all the final entries from 1882 to 1890 were completed by this method.[29] This abuse was particularly noted in timberland, where people got quick possession and then sold out. In some counties nine tenths of the tracts were disposed of within three months after the titles were secured. Meanwhile, the settlers had made a living and some profit by selling timber. The commuters were often Canadians or other aliens who returned to their old homes after their profitable ventures. A large proportion were women—school teachers and the like—who used this method of supplementing their salaries during the vacation months. In consequence of this monopolistic tendency, large areas of proved-up homesteads had neither habitation nor "evidence of genuine occupation" as homes.[30]

Oftentimes the speculation took the form of bonanza farming. Many thousands of acres would be amassed by hook or by crook, and the whole would be operated on a basis somewhat of a mixture between a feudal barony and a modern factory. Tenants and wage laborers worked with laborsaving machines of the latest design and highest efficiency. An investigator in the early 1880's traveled westward and southwestward from St. Paul and found numerous farms of from 20,000 to 40,000 acres. He also mentioned holdings in Kansas of from 10,000 to 100,000 acres, and some in Texas of from 50,000 to 350,000 acres. In the latter case he probably confused some cattle-range rights with actual ownership. In the twenty years following 1860 the number of United States farms of from 500 to 1000 acres had increased from 20,000 to 76,000, while the number above 1000 acres had grown from less than 6000 to nearly 29,000.[31]

Abuses in application of the Timber Culture Act of 1873, the Desert Land Act of 1877, and the Timber and Stone Act of 1878 were com-

[27] Industrial Commission *Report*, X, 789; XIX, 109, 110.

[28] *Sen. Doc.*, 58 Cong., 3 sess., no. 189, pp. 65-66. Commutation had been allowed by the act of 1862, U. S. *Revised Stat.*, sec. 2301.

[29] Compare *ibid.*, pp. 175 and 180.

[30] *Ibid.*, pp. viii, xvii-xviii, 69-78.

[31] Wm. Godwin Moody, *Land and Labor* (New York, 1883), pp. 33-61; 75.

parable to those under the Homestead Act, when not worse. Little advantage was taken of the Timber Culture Act. Till 1890 only about 9000 entries were proved up,[32] and the measure was repealed in the following year.[33] But persons having filed claims were allowed to continue under their contracts, and by 1904 over 65,000 entries had been perfected. By that date the annual number of final entries had dwindled to small proportions.[34] The Desert Land Act likewise failed to attract settlers, but it also was flagrantly abused. Of 37,000 original filings only 11,000 claims were proved up in the twenty-three years to 1900.[35] Most of these tracts had been absorbed by the big cattlemen and speculators. Two or three persons would get a half section each, and then form a corporation which was entitled to another 320 acres. Then they would form another corporation for the same purpose, and so on indefinitely. The speculator would buy stock in an irrigation ditch which connected with no reservoir, or would put up a pump where there was no water, and claim that he had qualified under the law for final title.[36]

Equally as certain as that railroad companies, private speculators, and loan companies profited most from the government's land policy, is the fact that the labor surplus became a constantly increasing factor in the national life after 1864. Between 1860 and 1890, while the total population of the country was doubling, the number of persons engaged in manufactures was multiplied by 3¼. In the two decades following 1870, as the population increased 63½ per cent, manufacturing labor more than doubled in number while the total engaged in agriculture grew by only 45 per cent.[37] The same years undoubtedly showed a growth in mining, transportation, clerical, and commercial labor commensurate

[32] *Sen. Doc.*, 58 Cong., 3 sess., no. 189, p. 183.

[33] 26 *U. S. Stat.*, 1095-1103. The repeal act of Mar. 3, 1891, is also mentioned in *Public Land Statutes of the United States*, Daniel M. Greene, compiler (Washington, 1931), p. 711. This volume, besides listing the acts in force at date of publication, also serves as an excellent index for land acts in general. The heading to paragraph 5116 in *U. S. Compiled Statutes*, 1918, John A. Mallory, compiler (St. Paul, 1918), lists the dates of the various amendments to the Timber Culture Act prior to its final repeal.

[34] *Sen. Doc.*, 58 Cong., 3 sess., no. 189, p. 183. Persons inclined to jeer at the idea of successful forestry projects on the Western Plains might well travel through Nebraska and the Dakotas and view for themselves the flourishing results of experiments started half a century ago under the "Tree Claim" Act.

[35] Industrial Commission *Report*, XIX, 113.

[36] *Sen. Doc.*, 58 Cong., 3 sess., no. 189, pp. xix-xx.

[37] *Statistical Abstract*, 1913, no. 36, pp. 660, 666. This number was used instead of an older one merely because it was the earliest easily available and as good as any for the purpose. Agricultural labor for 1870 is listed at 5,922,471 and in 1890 at 8,565,926 (the latter figure is slightly more than the one given by the Industrial Commission, see text and next note). For the corresponding dates manufacturing labor stood at 2,053,996 and 4,251,535.

with that of the manufacturing industries. But to the ranks of wage laborers there ought to be added also the hired workmen on the land and, as far as independence is concerned, the tenant farmers as well. The Industrial Commission accounted for 8,395,634 persons engaged in agriculture in 1890, of whom 3,004,061 were hired laborers. In addition, there were no less than 1,500,000 tenant workmen.[38] This leaves less than 4,000,000 persons tilling land of their own, including all the mortgaged farms. Only three eighths of the families of the United States were cultivating the soil "as owners, tenants, or laborers", and the ratio was declining constantly.[39] Over half of these were on an economic basis scarcely if any better than that of the city laborer.[40]

Even though farm help was scarce before 1900, the agricultural depression and low wages prevented recruiting from the unemployed in the cities. In fact, the scarcity was said to be "greatest in the vicinity of manufacturing establishments . . . and in sections where railroads or other public works are being constructed". Farmers in Vermont were making use of the immigration offices, and in California the Chinese labor bureaus were patronized. Not only was the workingman unable to take advantage of free land in the West, he could see no prospect of gain in changing from factory to farm employment even in the East. Farm population increased "faster than its opportunities for rural employment";[41] then the surplus moved to the towns or cities, and, once caught in the industrial toils, seldom returned. The farm added its toll to the unemployed of the industrial centers, but the city, like a devouring Moloch, failed to give back its victims. The years of agricultural distress in the 1870's and 1880's were accompanied by an ever-increasing roll of unemployed in the cities. Even the pioneers on the homesteads, baffled by fortune and beaten by nature, edged their way back, more often than not, to the ancestral farms and from there to the factory and, too frequently, to the bread line.

Henry George, writing a full fifteen years before "Coin" Harvey achieved fame, spoke of the "harder times, the lower wages, the increasing poverty perceptible in the United States". From every civilized country he heard "complaints of industrial depression; of labor con-

[38] Industrial Commission *Report*, XI, 77; the *Statistical Abstract*, 1931, no. 53, p. 647, shows 1,294,913 tenants in 1890, but, counting the work of the families, the number of laborers must have been considerably more.

[39] George K. Holmes, "The Supply of Farm Labor", American Academy of Political and Social Science, *Annals*, XXXIII (Jan.-June, 1909), 362.

[40] The average wages of farm labor from 1879 to 1899 ranged from $10.43 to $14.07 a month, with board, Industrial Commission *Report*, XI, 139.

[41] *Ibid.*, X, xix; XIX, 121.

demned to involuntary idleness; of capital massed and wasting; of pecuniary distress among business men; of want and suffering and anxiety among the working classes". His rallying tocsin was that "amid the greatest accumulations of wealth, men die of starvation, and puny infants suckle dry breasts . . . ".[42] Ah yes! but why listen to Henry George? He was just a single tax "crank". Or why hearken to the vaporings of that Utopian dreamer Edward Bellamy? Perhaps also Henry Demarest Lloyd should be waved aside as being possessed of a single-track mind, or, better yet, for having a mind at all. But still other witnesses raise their heads—men who gained the ear of the respectable classes who would listen neither to radicals nor "high brows". One of these was Godwin Moody, who published testimonials from David Davis, George W. Curtis, and George F. Hoar as to the soundness of his thinking. Davis accepted without question the statement that a third of the whole population of the country was "prostrated by want of employment and of reasonable reward for their toil". Hoar assumed as part of his own thinking that laborers must get higher wages and fewer hours as "their share of the increased production caused by the invention and perfection of machinery". Moody himself saw, as the principal changes of a half century before 1880, the rise of bonanza and tenant farming side by side, the growth of congested slums, the development of armies of compulsorily unemployed—half of the people overworked and the other half idle.[43]

But Moody was inclined to exaggerate. Of 17,000,000 belonging to the productive classes he could find that 7,000,000 were idle or working so little of the time as to be dependent. Also, after all, he must have been a radical, for he proposed a six-hour day at increased wages as the only solution for unemployment.[44] The historian, therefore, must return to the established authorities. No person has denied that there were a million men unemployed in the North alone in 1865, and none has demonstrated that the number ever became perceptibly or permanently smaller. Most textbooks will recount the wage-cutting orgies of the 1870's and the suppression of labor revolt by armies of hired retainers or by military force. They will tell also of the railroad, steel, and mining strikes in the great upheaval of the 1880's, when the coldest of official and judicial brutality toward the hunger-driven jobless could be hailed as the sublimation of social justice. Where then was the siren call of the free lands? Carroll D. Wright, and he is a conservative

[42] Henry George, *Progress and Poverty* (New York, 1879), pp. 5, 8, 354.

[43] Moody, see testimonials in back; pp. 286-288.

[44] *Ibid.*, pp. 252-275, 310.

enough authority, after the most careful of deductions, listed the number of unemployed in all fields except those of professional and personal service in 1885 at 998,839. But he admits that, taking all kinds of unemployment, the number was above 1,300,000.[45] However, he is best in his last report as labor commissioner in Massachusetts. Of 816,470 total employable persons in that state in 1884-1885 he accounted for 241,589, or 29.59 per cent of the total, idle or employed only a few months in the year.[46]

Before the establishment of the Massachusetts Bureau of Statistics of Labor, in 1869, there were hardly any reliable calculations of unemployment. But a fairly trustworthy source listed 20,000 idle in the city of New York in 1868.[47] Some reports credited Massachusetts with as many as 300,000 unemployed mechanics during the dismal years following 1873, but Wright would cut the number to a tenth as many. On this basis he would also reduce the estimated 3,000,000 for the United States in the same proportion.[48] But his own liberal estimate for 1885 might tend to show that he was unduly conservative in his earlier calculations. The difference between mechanics and all employable persons is a wide one, and it is difficult to believe that the depression of the middle eighties was so much worse than the Panic of 1873.

But, whatever the basis of calculation, it cannot be denied that unemployment was a major economic ailment in every decade from 1865 to the close of the century, and it is equally certain that free land did not solve the problem. No doubt there was once a time in American history when underpaid, unemployed, or dissatisfied laborers could take their choice between continuing as intermittent wage employees or becoming freehold farmers; that wages of industrial labor were higher for that undefined period than they otherwise would have been; and that industrial strife, in consequence, was kept at a minimum. A more certain fact is that such conditions have not existed since the coming of the factory system. In other words, the much vaunted cheap or free public lands of the country, whatever may have been their effect in other regards, since the rise of a class-conscious labor group have not been of measurable consequence as an alleviator of labor conditions.

FRED A. SHANNON.

Kansas State College.

[45] [U. S.] Commissioner of Labor, *First Annual Report: Industrial Depressions* (1886), p. 65.

[46] Massachusetts Bureau of Statistics of Labor, *Eighteenth Annual Report* (Boston, 1887), p. 277.

[47] Cited in John R. Commons and others, *History of Labour in the United States* (New York, 1918), II, 123.

[48] [U. S.] Commissioner of Labor, *First Annual Report: Industrial Depressions*, p. 64.

THE HOMESTEAD LAW IN AN INCONGRUOUS LAND SYSTEM [1]

THE Homestead Act of 1862 is one of the most important laws which have been enacted in the history of this country, but its significance has been distorted and grossly misinterpreted. An important misconception concerning the Homestead Act is that its adoption marked a more or less complete break with the past, in that the lands which previously had been considered as a source of revenue were now to be given free to settlers. As part of this interpretation it is held that direct land sales virtually ceased except for transactions under the Pre-emption Law, the commutation clause of the Homestead Act, the Timber and Stone Act, and the Desert Land Act. Each of the first three of these acts permitted the purchase by individuals of 160 acres and the Desert Land Act permitted the purchase of an additional 640 acres, making a total which could be acquired under them of 1120 acres. Aside from this maximum which was open to purchasers, the accepted view is that speculators [2] in lands were barred from direct transactions at the land offices and that, to secure large tracts, they were forced to operate through dummy entrymen or buy from states and railroads.

To state this view differently, it is held that after 1862 the chief way in which settlers and speculators alike acquired land from the government was through the Pre-emption and Homestead laws and their subsequent modifications. Indeed, some writers have maintained that the region beyond the Mississippi was largely settled by homesteaders taking up free land under the Act of 1862. Congressman Harvey B. Ferguson stated in 1914, "It was great statesmanship that created the homestead laws under which such a State as Iowa developed".[3] Another

[1] The material for this article was gathered in part while the writer was Fellow of the Social Science Research Council in 1933 and 1934. Grateful acknowledgments are due to the Council and especially to Donald Young of its staff for many kindnesses. The article was completed while the writer was engaged in a study of Recent Land Policies of the United States for the Land Policy Section of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, later the Resettlement Administration.

[2] The word "speculator", as used in this article, refers to large-scale land operators, and does not include many farmers who speculated in a small way.

[3] "Grazing Homesteads and the Regulation of Grazing on the Public Lands", *Hearing before the Committee on the Public Lands,* House of Representatives, 63 Cong., 2 sess., pt. 1, p. 358.

writer made an even broader statement as follows: "Under the homestead law were taken up the rich agricultural alluvial lands of the central Mississippi basin. . . ."[4] Even Professor Hibbard, the authority on American land policies, has misunderstood the developments in land matters after 1862. He states that land sales made after 1862 were "only in connection with preemption and miscellaneous parcels of land, the preemptions covering by far the larger part of the operations". He also states that a congressional resolution, expressing opposition to the further sale of agricultural lands, which passed the House in 1868 but failed of adoption in the Senate, was virtually "tantamount to a law".[5] As these views have been widely accepted it is essential to examine briefly their source and then to test their accuracy.

The principle of free homesteads for settlers had long been the goal for which the West had struggled, and as each succeeding land law, more liberal than its predecessor, was passed, that goal came constantly nearer until, in 1862, it was attained. So generous seemed this policy in contrast with the earlier one of regarding the lands as a source of revenue, and so significant did it appear prospectively, that it became the subject of eulogy at the outset. Furthermore, the measure had been sponsored by the Republican party and when this party was later accused of representing the interests of large capitalistic combines and of neglecting the farmers, its leaders pointed to the Homestead Act as a refutation of the accusation.[6] Consequently there was built up around the law a halo of political and economic significance which has greatly magnified the importance to be attributed to it and which has misled practically every historian and economist who has dealt with land policies. The Homestead Law has been considered the capstone of an increasingly liberal land policy, and to it has been ascribed the rapid settlement of the West and the large percentage of farmer owners in the United States. It has also been regarded as providing an outlet for the discontented and surplus labor of the East with the result that, as compared with

[4] Leifur Magnusson, *Disposition of the Public Lands of the United States with Particular Reference to Wage-Earning-Labor* (Washington, 1919), p. 29. See also Arthur C. Cole, *The Irrepressible Conflict, 1850-1865* (New York, 1934), pp. 119, 357; John Ise, *The United States Forest Policy* (New Haven, 1920), p. 56.

[5] Benjamin Horace Hibbard, *History of the Public Land Policies* (New York, 1924), pp. 111, 112.

[6] The shallowness of this contention was pointed out by George W. Julian in 1884 (*Political Recollections, 1840 to 1872*, Chicago, 1884, p. 218). Speaking of the continuation of cash sales, railroad grants, and disposal of the Indian lands as fatal to the homestead principle, he said that they furnished "a remarkable commentary upon the boasted friendship of the Republican party for the landless poor".

European countries, high wage rates have prevailed in that section. The influence of free land has been blithely discussed by writers who have never taken the time to examine the facts with which they dealt so lightly.[7]

The source of most of these ideas concerning the Homestead Law is, of course, the *Congressional Globe,* later the *Record,* upon which so many writers completely depend. A careful reading of the congressional debates should, however, lead one to question the general conception above outlined. Professor Hibbard bases his generalizations upon even more untrustworthy evidence. He quotes from the *Report* of the Commissioner of the General Land Office for 1863 wherein it is stated that it is not the design of Congress "to look to the public lands as a source of direct revenue",[8] and, from the exceedingly small amount of sales reported in the first year that the Homestead Law was in operation, draws the inference that cash sales were thenceforth of no importance. Professor Hibbard may also have been depending upon a statement made by that great compiler of land statistics, Thomas Donaldson, in his book, *The Public Domain,* originally published in 1880, in which it is stated that lands available for cash entry are few and isolated, except for those in the five Southern states of Alabama, Louisiana, Florida, Arkansas, and Mississippi. The statement was correct in general in 1880, in so far as it applied to the lands ordinarily described as "public domain",[9] but there were many million acres of rich agricultural lands which at that time were rapidly being brought into the market for cash sale by the Federal government.[10] It would not apply at all to the period prior to 1880 when large areas of the best agricultural lands in the country were subject to sale.

It is the purpose of this paper to show that the Homestead Law did not completely change our land system, that its adoption merely superimposed upon the old land system a principle out of harmony with it, and that until 1890 the old and the new constantly clashed. In presenting this view it will appear that the Homestead Law did not end the

[7] In contrast, Herbert Heaton ventures the view that the importance of free land in drawing immigrants to America has been overestimated while the influence of high wages has been underestimated. "Migration and Cheap Land—the End of Two Chapters", *The Sociological Review,* XXVI (July, 1934), 237.

[8] *Report,* 1863, p. 7. See also *Report,* Secretary of the Interior, 1862, p. 4.

[9] 1884 edition, pp. 25, 415. It is worth noting that a total of 4,851,296 acres was entered in Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota in the eighties with cash, scrip, and warrants. This is exclusive of pre-emption, homestead, and other limited entries.

[10] These lands, which were being ceded by the Indians, are neglected by both Donaldson and Hibbard.

auction system or cash sales, as is generally assumed, that speculation and land monopolization continued after its adoption as widely perhaps as before, and within as well as without the law, that actual homesteading was generally confined to the less desirable lands distant from railroad lines, and that farm tenancy developed in frontier communities in many instances as a result of the monopolization of the land. The efforts to abolish cash sales will also be outlined briefly.

The moderate land reformers of the mid-nineteenth century believed that the enactment of a homestead measure would retard if not end speculation in public lands.[11] They argued that once free homesteads were available to settlers speculators would no longer have a market for their lands and all inducements to purchase in advance of settlement would be ended. Parenthetically, similar arguments have been advanced by certain historians to prove that there was little or no profit in land speculation.[12] The land reformers reckoned too lightly, however, with the astuteness of the speculators who in the past had either succeeded in emasculating laws inimical to their interests or had actually flouted such laws in the very faces of the officials appointed to administer them.

From the outset the cards were stacked against the efficient and successful operation of the Homestead Law. Other acts in existence in 1862 greatly limited its application and new laws further restricting it were subsequently enacted. The administration of the law, both in Washington and in the field, was frequently in the hands of persons unsympathetic to its principle,[13] and Western interests, though lauding

[11] The more advanced reformers demanded that all sales should be discontinued, grants to railroads and other special interests ended, and all the public lands reserved for actual settlers under the provisions of the homestead measure. The differences between what may be called the moderate and the radical land reformers is apparent in the congressional debates. See also George M. Stephenson, *The Political History of the Public Lands from 1840 to 1862* (Boston, 1917), p. 166 and elsewhere; Roy M. Robbins, "Horace Greeley: Land Reform and Unemployment, 1837-1862", *Agricultural History*, VII (Jan., 1933), 26, *passim;* St. George L. Sioussat, "Andrew Johnson and the Early Phases of the Homestead Bill", *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, V (Dec., 1918), 253, *passim;* Hibbard, p. 347, *passim;* John Bell Sanborn, "Some Political Aspects of Homestead Legislation", *Am. Hist. Rev.*, VI (Oct., 1900), 19, *passim.*

[12] Speaking of the period from 1836 to 1876 Professor Joseph Schafer writes: "It was, in this period, a rare thing for an outside speculator in wild lands to make any profit on his speculation." *Wisconsin Magazine of History*, XIII (June, 1930), 428. See also his *The Wisconsin Lead Region, Wisconsin Domesday Book*, "General Studies", III (Madison, 1932), p. 153; *Wisconsin Domesday Book, Town Studies* (1924), I, 10.

[13] Wm. A. J. Sparks, commissioner of the General Land Office, in his *Report* for 1885 (pp. 3-4), writes as follows concerning the administration of the land laws:

> I found that the magnificent estate of the nation in its public lands had been to a wide extent wasted under defective and improvident laws and through a

the act, were ever ready to pervert it. The existence of the Pre-emption Law and its later variations, the Desert Land Act, the Timber Culture Act, the Timber and Stone Act, the land grants to railroads and states, the cash sale system, the Indian land policy, the acts granting land warrants to ex-soldiers or their heirs, and the Agricultural College Act of 1862, which granted millions of acres of land scrip to Eastern states, tended to make it practically as easy for speculators to engross huge areas of land after 1862 as before.

The retention of the Pre-emption Law and the commutation clause of the Homestead Law made it possible for timber dealers,[14] cattle graziers, mining interests, and speculators to continue to acquire lands through the use of dummy entrymen, false swearing, and, often, the connivance of local land officers. That this was done on a large scale is evident by the frequent and sometimes pathetic admissions of the apparently helpless land commissioners. The Desert Land Act, the Timber Culture Act, and the Timber and Stone Act provided even greater opportunities for dummy entrymen to enter lands and assign them to hidden land engrossers.[15] The palpable frauds committed and

> laxity of public administration astonishing in a business sense if not culpable in recklessness of official responsibility.
>
> The widespread belief of the people of this country that the land department has been very largely conducted to the advantage of speculation and monopoly, private and corporate, rather than in the public interest, I have found supported by developments in every branch of the service. It seems that the prevailing idea running through this office and those subordinate to it was that the government had no distinctive rights to be considered and no special interests to protect; hence, as between the government and spoilers of the public domain, the government usually had the worst of it. I am satisfied that thousands of claims without foundation in law or equity, involving millions of acres of public land, have been annually passed to patent upon the single proposition that nobody but the government had any *adverse* interest.
>
> The vast machinery of the land department appears to have been devoted to the chief result of conveying the title of the United States to public lands upon fraudulent entries under strained constructions of imperfect public land laws and upon illegal claims under public and private grants.

[14] Ise, *passim*, has drawn together and summarized the published information concerning the vast frauds committed by the lumber interests in their efforts to acquire great areas of timber lands. See also Jenks Cameron, *The Development of Governmental Forest Control in the United States* (Baltimore, 1928), *passim*.

[15] The commissioners of the General Land Office from 1875 onward recommended annually the repeal of the Pre-emption Law; in 1883 the commissioner recommended the repeal of the commutation clause of the Homestead Law and the Timber Culture Act (*Report*, 1883, pp. 6-7); in 1884 the commissioner suggested the repeal of these laws and the Desert Land Act and the Timber and Stone Act. *Ibid.*, 1883, pp. 6-8. These documents are cited hereafter as G.L.O. *Report*.

the large areas transferred under these acts and their interference with the homestead principle lead one to suspect that their enactment and retention were the results of political pressure by interested groups.

It was not entirely necessary, however, for speculators to resort to these illegal and fraudulent methods of acquiring land since Congress proceeded to aid their schemes by enacting a series of laws which went far toward vitiating the principle of land for the landless. By continuing after 1862 the policy of granting lands to railroads to encourage their construction, Congress from the outset struck a severe blow at the principle of free homesteads. In the eight years after the passage of the Homestead Law five times as much land was granted to railroads as had been given in the twelve preceding years; 127,628,000 acres were granted between 1862 and 1871 to aid in the extension of the railroad net and 2,000,000 acres were granted for wagon roads and canals. Such imperial generosity was at the expense of future homesteaders who must purchase the land.[16] As it was necessary to withdraw all lands from entry in the regions through which such roads were projected to prevent speculators from anticipating the railroads in making selections of land, and as the routes were rarely definitely established when the grants were made, more than double this amount of land was withdrawn from entry and remained unavailable to settlement for a long period of years.[17]

The railroads were, of course, built through undeveloped regions and, other things being equal, routes were selected which would ensure to the companies the largest amount of what was then considered to be the best agricultural land. When the alternate government sections were finally restored to market settlers were frequently outbid for them by speculators.[18] Moreover, the provision in the Homestead Law which confined the homesteader to eighty acres within the limits of a railroad

[16] Computed from Donaldson, pp. 258-273. The best criticism by a contemporary of the railroad land grant policy, is found in Henry George, *Our Land and Land Policy, National and State* (San Francisco, 1871). See also George W. Julian, "Railway Influence in the Land Office", *North American Review*, CXXXVI (Mar., 1883), 237-256, and his "Our Land-Grant Railways in Congress", *International Review*, XIV (Feb.-Mar., 1883), 198-212.

[17] G.L.O. *Report*, 1885, pp. 26, *passim*. As late as 1883, twelve years after the last land grant was made to railroads, it was estimated that more than 100,000,000 acres were withdrawn from settlement pending selection of the railroad sections. Julian, *N. Am. Rev.*, CXXXVI, 252.

[18] For large speculative purchases within the limits of the Illinois Central Railroad grant, see Paul Wallace Gates, *The Illinois Central Railroad and its Colonization Work* (Cambridge, 1934), pp. 107, 123 ff.

grant [19] was sufficient to send many homeseekers farther afield. On the railroad sections, of course, no free homesteading was permitted and thus the prospective settler found it necessary to go far from transportation facilities in order to take advantage of the government's bounty. In numerous instances the land policies of the railroads encouraged speculative and large-scale purchases with the result that millions of acres were turned into bonanza farms, such as those found in Dakota Territory,[20] or were rented or leased to incoming settlers who had expected to find free land available to them.

These grants to railroads after 1862 were a limitation on the homestead principle and indicate cynical indifference to the idealistic expressions constantly voiced concerning the principle. That some doubt existed among members of Congress as to the propriety of continuing to make grants for railroads is revealed by a resolution adopted by the House in 1870 [21] which stated:

> That in the judgement of this House the policy of granting subsidies in public lands to railroad and other corporations ought to be discontinued; and that every consideration of public policy and equal justice to the whole people requires that the public lands of the United States should be held for the exclusive purpose of securing homesteads to actual settlers under the homestead and preëmption laws, subject to reasonable appropriations of such lands for the purposes of education.

Although adopted without any debate the resolution was just a bluff, for within the next twelve months Congress made one of the largest and most indefensible of the railroad grants which, together with a number of smaller ones, totaled nearly 20,000,000 acres.[22] The anti-railroad feeling which swept over the West in the early seventies finally brought these grants to an end. After 1871 no more grants were made [23] although various interests were at the time seeking additional grants which, if made, would have required practically all the valuable lands remaining to the government.

[19] This provision was practically repealed by the acts of Mar. 3, 1879 (20 *U. S. Stat.*, 472), July 1, 1879 (21 *U. S. Stat.*, 46), and June 15, 1880 (*ibid.*, p. 238).

[20] James B. Hedges, "The Colonization Work of the Northern Pacific Railroad", *Mississippi Valley Hist. Rev.*, XIII (Dec., 1926), 327; Harold E. Briggs, "Early Bonanza Farming in the Red River Valley of the North", *Agricultural History*, VI (Jan., 1932), 26, *passim;* Alva H. Benton, "Large Land Holdings in North Dakota", *Journal of Land and Public Utility Economics*, I (Oct., 1925), 405-413.

[21] *Cong. Globe*, 41 Cong., 2 sess., p. 2095.

[22] Donaldson, p. 272.

[23] Lewis H. Haney, *A Congressional History of Railways in the United States* (Madison, 1910), II, 20-22; Stephenson, p. 122, n.

The continuation of the policy of granting to the states Federal lands within their borders was likewise contrary to the homestead principle. With the exception of the swamp land grants, the purpose of these donations was to provide the states with a valuable commodity, the sale of which would produce revenue or endowment for educational and other state institutions. Over 72,000,000 acres were granted to states which came into the Union after 1862 while other states had their grants increased subsequent to the enactment of the Homestead law.[24] It is safe to say that over 140,000,000 acres of land were in the hands of the states for disposition after 1862.[25] The philosophy behind the grants, and frequently the conditions embedded in the donations, required their sale at the highest market price. The states were prevented, therefore, from giving homesteads to settlers and the prices asked for their lands, with the exception of the swamp lands which were generally sold at low prices or granted to railroads, made them the prey of speculators. It is true that limitations were sometimes placed on the amount of land which individuals could purchase, but dummy entrymen were usually employed to circumvent such restrictions.[26] The states, like the railroads, naturally endeavored to secure the best possible lands in order to ensure large returns therefrom. The following table,[27] showing the land sales of and the prices received by representative states, reveals clearly that persons seeking cheap or free lands found little encouragement from state officials.

State	*Net amount of land sold to date*	*Average price per acre*
Idaho [28]	838,140	$16.90
Kansas	3,064,547	3.22
Minnesota	2,306,600	6.53
Montana	1,587,488	15.50
North Dakota	1,686,436	16.73
South Dakota	873,960	35.22
Utah	3,448,876	2.44

[24] Computed from G.L.O. *Report*, 1932, pp. 45-50.

[25] A total of 230,088,219 acres have been patented to the states of which 38,206,487 acres were given for railroads, 3,359,188 acres for wagon roads, and 6,842,921 acres for canals. Most of these special grants were quickly transferred to construction companies or disposed of by the states. The total also includes 7,672,800 acres in land scrip which was granted to the states in which there were no remaining public lands for the endowment of agricultural colleges. The scrip could not be located by the states and had to be sold promptly. Of the remaining lands granted, or which were subsequently granted to the states, it seems safe to say that at least 140,000,000 acres were still unsold to 1862.

[26] U. S. Department of Commerce and Labor, Bureau of Corporations, *The Lumber Industry* (1913), pt. 1, p. 252.

[27] Computed from reports of the land offices of the respective states.

[28] To 1918.

The maintenance of the cash sale system after the Homestead Law went into operation did even greater violence to the principle of free lands. It is not generally appreciated that there were available in 1862 for cash sale 83,919,649 acres of land.[29] Contrary to the views of Hibbard and others, this figure was later increased to well over 100,000,000 acres by the opening up of new lands to the auction and cash sale system.[30] Throughout the sixties and seventies and, indeed, until 1888 the government continued to offer land at auction in Oregon, Washington, California, Kansas, Nebraska, Colorado, New Mexico, and in practically all of the states in the Lakes region and in the Mississippi Valley where it still had land. It is true that after 1870 most of the land so offered was timbered but by then a goodly portion of the arable lands had been surveyed and opened to sale. The richest and most fertile sections of Kansas, Nebraska, Missouri, California, Washington, and Oregon were thus open to the cash purchaser after the enactment of the Homestead Law and, as will be seen later, great landed estates were acquired through outright purchase in these states.

Little attention has been devoted by historians to the Indian lands and yet there is a story involved in their disposition totally at variance with the conventional account of the era of free land. At the time the Homestead Law was passed the government was following the policy of concentrating the Indians on reservations where they would be in less conflict with white settlers. The rights of the Indians in lands claimed by them were recognized and, when they were persuaded to leave a hunting area over which they claimed ownership to dwell in a reservation, they were generally compensated for their lands either by the Federal government or by a purchaser acting with the consent of the government. Some of the lands were ceded outright to the government for a consideration; others were ceded in trust, the lands to be sold for the benefit of the Indians; the disposition of still others to railroads was authorized in a number of treaties. As these Indian lands were frequently the very choicest and contained some improvements they were much desired by speculators. No uniform policy concerning their final disposition was worked out—both legislative and administrative regulations as to their disposal varying widely—and consequently

[29] G.L.O. *Report*, 1862, p. 8.

[30] Volumes of "Proclamations for Public Land Sales", General Land Office; G.L.O. *Reports*, 1862 and following. It is true that 46,000,000 acres in the South were withdrawn from cash entry under the Act of June 21, 1866, but these lands were restored to sale in 1876 and during the interval the amount of land disposed of was small, amounting to only 2,000,000 acres by 1871. Computed from G.L.O. *Report*, 1871, p. 343.

speculators were able to get their grasp on them more easily than if the lands had been subject to a clearly defined policy. The only consistent rule concerning them was that they must be sold for a consideration, which, of course, denied to the homesteader the right to enter them free. The obligation of the government to compensate the Indian for his land did not necessitate a policy of sale to settlers but the revenue complex with reference to the public lands was still prevalent in spite of the Homestead Law, and the Indian lands were reserved for cash sale.

The amount of land in Indian reservations or claimed by the Indians in 1862 was probably 175,000,000 acres.[31] The land was scattered throughout the Western states, but large amounts were concentrated in the states of Kansas and Nebraska and the Dakota and Indian territories into which settlers were eagerly pressing in the sixties, seventies, and eighties, or where they looked longingly for lands. At the outset, these lands were sold in large blocks to groups of capitalists and railroads, as is seen below, without being offered in small lots. Slightly later they were appraised, generally at high valuations, offered at auction and sold to the highest bidders. Still later, some of the Indian lands were sold in small tracts to settlers, a slight concession to the homeseekers.[32]

The Indian Allotment Act of 1887, as modified by the Burke Act of 1906[33] and subsequent measures, was undoubtedly in part the result of Western pressure to have the lands of the Indians made available to white settlement. These acts provided for the allotment of Indian lands and eventually for their sale. The Dawes Act continued the policy whereby the government purchased the surplus lands from the Indians and subsequently resold them, but it provided that lands so acquired in the future should be reserved for actual settlers in tracts of 160 acres. This provision did not apply to ceded lands transferred before 1887 nor did it open the ceded lands to free homesteading. Congress has been consistent at least in requiring payment for Indian land. Between 100,000,000 and 125,000,000 acres of Indian land have been sold since

[31] Indian reservations and claims were not sharply defined in 1862, much of the area not having been surveyed. In 1875 the Commission of Indian Affairs (*Report*, 1875, p. 142) gave the acreage in Indian reservations as 165,729,714 acres. The amount of Indian lands sold directly to individuals and corporations and that sold through the General Land Office during the years 1862-1875 would bring this figure to 175,000,000 acres for 1862.

[32] There is little available information on the Indian lands and their disposition, the most important published source being the *Annual Reports* of the Commissioners of Indian Affairs during the years after the Civil War.

[33] 24 *U. S. Stat.*, 388; 34 *U. S. Stat.*, 182.

1862, practically one half as much as the total acreage which has been entered under the Homestead Law.[34]

With over 125,000,000 acres of railroad lands,[35] 140,000,000 acres of state lands, 100,000,000 acres of Indian lands, and 100,000,000 acres of Federal lands for sale in large or small blocks, and with the opportunities for evasion of the Homestead and Pre-emption laws and their variations outlined above, it is obvious that there were few obstacles in the way of speculation and land monopolization after 1862. As before, it was still possible for foresighted speculators to precede settlers into the frontier, purchase the best lands, and hold them for the anticipated increase in value which the succeeding wave of settlers would give to them. It has heretofore been maintained that the existence of free land after 1862 greatly diminished the speculators' chances of profit and consequently limited their activities. This view will not bear careful scrutiny. Except for the squatters' claims, the speculators were generally able to secure the most desirable lands, that is, those easily brought under cultivation, fertile and close to timber, water, markets, and lines of communication. The subsequent settler had the choice of buying at the speculators' prices, from the land grant railroads which held their alternate tracts at equally high prices, from the states whose land policies were less generous than those of the Federal government, or of going farther afield to exercise his homestead privilege where facilities for social and economic intercourse were limited. The fact that their lands were more advantageously situated was effectively advertised by the land companies. Thus the American Emigrant Company in advertising its Iowa lands in the sixties summed up under the caption "Better than a Free Homestead" all the disadvantages of free land:

[34] Recent addresses by John Collier, commissioner of Indian Affairs, and Senator William H. King have called attention to the alienation of Indian lands since the Allotment Act of 1887, but they have not been concerned with the previous crowding of the Indians on the reservations and the forced cession or sale of their surplus lands which antedated that act. See the speech of Senator King on "Condition of Indians in the United States", *Senate Document*, 72 Cong., 2 sess., no. 214. It is difficult to estimate the total amount of Indian land which was sold prior to 1887 and after 1862 but it would certainly bring the total Indian land sales since 1862 to over 100,000,000 acres.

[35] The railroads have received 132,425,574 acres of land directly from the Federal government or from grants originally given to the states for railroad construction. *Report*, Secretary of the Interior, 1934, p. 73. This amount would be greatly augmented by grants made by the State of Texas from its public lands and by other states from the swamp lands received from the Federal government, and also by the lands purchased by railroads from the Indians. As used here only the 132,425,574 acres are considered. Only a small part of this vast area was sold prior to 1862. Not all of it was available for sale even by 1871 but this total represents all the land which the railroads received from congressional land grants.

Under the homestead law the settler must, in order to get a good location, go far out into the wild and unsettled districts, and for many years be deprived of school privileges, churches, mills, bridges, and in fact of all the advantages of society.[36]

Settlers arriving in Kansas—to consider a typical state—between 1868 and 1872 were greeted with advertisements announcing that the choicest lands in the state had been selected by the State Agricultural College which was now offering 90,000 acres for sale on long term credits. The Central Branch of the Union Pacific Railroad offered 1,200,000 acres for prices ranging from $1.00 to $15.00 per acre; the Kansas Pacific Railroad offered 5,000,000 acres for $1.00 to $6.00 per acre; the Kansas and Neosho Valley Railroad offered 1,500,000 acres for sale at $2.00 to $8.00 per acre; the Capital Land Agency of Topeka offered 1,000,000 acres of Kansas land for sale;[37] Van Doren and Havens offered 200,000 acres for $3.00 to $10.00 per acre; T. H. Walker offered 10,000 (or 100,000) acres[38] for $5.00 to $10.00 per acre; Hendry and Noyes offered 50,000 acres; and even the United States government was advertising for bids for approximately 6000 acres of Sac and Fox Indian lands.[39] That virgin lands in Kansas were selling for substantial prices in this period is shown by the following tables:

Table showing Sales of State Lands[40]

		Acres	*Average price per acre*
Common School lands	(1865-1882)	450,764	$4.00
Agricultural College lands	(1868-1882)	48,465	4.78
University lands	(1878-1882)	6,224	2.88
Normal School lands	(1876-1882)	4,966	4.72

[36] Pamphlet: *Two Thousand Families Wanted For Iowa*, n. d., n. p.

[37] Letterhead of letter of W. C. Fitzsimmons, a member of the firm, July 15, 1871, to E. S. Parker, commissioner of Indian Affairs, file of material on Indian land sales, Indian Office.

[38] In June, 1870, Walker was advertising 10,000 acres of Kansas land for sale (Leavenworth *Bulletin*, June 13, 1870), while in February, 1871, he was advertising 100,000 acres for sale (*ibid.*, Feb. 7, 1871). Thaddeus H. Walker of Topeka, Kansas, formerly of Washington County, New York, had entered in 1855 to 1859 in the Kickapoo, Kansas, Land District 16,000 acres, 46,000 acres in the Lecompton, Kansas, Land District, 14,000 acres in the Junction City, Kansas, Land District, and 4600 acres in the Decorah, Iowa, Land District. The lands were entered mostly with military land warrants. See the abstract and entry books of the above-mentioned land districts in the General Land Office.

[39] The advertisements appeared in the *Kansas Farmer*, the Leavenworth *Bulletin*, the Lawrence *Republican Daily Journal*, the *Cultivator and Country Gentleman*, and the *American Agriculturist*.

[40] *Biennial Report*, Auditor of State, Kansas, 1882, pp. 359-360.

Table showing Land Sales of Atchison, Topeka, and Santa Fe Railroad[41]

Total Sales from March 1, 1871, to Dec. 31, 1879

Year	*Acres*	*Principal*	*Average price per acre*
1871	71,801.51	$ 425,013.75	$5.91
1872	45,328.81	269,627.66	5.94
1873	133,507.30	748,977.25	5.61
1874	200,459.96	900,973.30	4.49
1875	75,415.33	416,409.85	5.52
1876	122,201.17	665,455.17	5.44½
1877	85,047.78	423,477.49	4.98
1878	267,122.47	1,206,527.64	4.52
1879	104,744.41	494,353.73	4.72
Total	1,105,628.74	$5,550,815.84	$5.02

Such sales—and many others might be cited—are evidence that free homesteads on the most desirable land were not available in this state to incoming settlers.

A strong impulse to speculation was provided by the existence of large amounts of land warrants, chiefly those of the Act of March 3, 1855,[42] which were to be had in the market at prices of a dollar an acre or less.[43] They could be used to locate solid blocks of land wherever the surveyed area of the public domain was open to cash entry. In addition, it is startling to find a provision in the Agricultural College Act of July 2, 1862, whereby 7,672,800 acres in land scrip,[44] which likewise could be used to locate surveyed lands open to cash entry, were

[41] Compiled from *Annual Reports* of the Atchison, Topeka, and Santa Fe Railroad, 1873-1880.

[42] 10 *U. S. Stat.*, 701-702. It should be pointed out that prior to the adoption of the prospective pre-emption principle public lands were not subject to disposal until they had been surveyed and offered at public auction. Lands then remaining unsold were subject to private entry for cash, scrip, or warrants. After prospective pre-emption was adopted settlers could make claims upon surveyed but unoffered lands, thus preceding the speculators. When the homestead idea was being debated its advocates argued that its effects would be largely mitigated unless all lands were withdrawn from speculative entry upon its passage. Such a radical proposal was too much for many homestead advocates and it failed of serious consideration. Nevertheless, it was expected by many people that no additional lands would be offered at auction after 1862 and therefore the area open to private entry would become progressively smaller as time passed. Unfortunately, additional land was put up at auction in the sixties, seventies, and eighties, thus increasing the areas open to speculative and large-scale entries. At the same time land was being opened to homestead and pre-emption entry which was not offered at auction and therefore not subject to private entry for cash, scrip, or warrants.

[43] G.L.O. *Report*, 1862, p. 9. In 1862 there were 7,123,380 acres of military warrants outstanding.

[44] 12 *U. S. Stat.*, 503-505; "Report of the Public Lands Commission", 1905, *Sen. Doc.*, 58 Cong., 3 sess., no. 189, p. 361.

thrown on the market. Within a comparatively short time this scrip depreciated greatly in value. Some states sold their scrip for an average price of less than fifty cents an acre and such prices tempted many individuals to purchase and locate large areas in the Western states.[45] Probably no other scrip or warrant act was used so extensively by speculators to build up large holdings as was this Agricultural College Act. Other special acts were passed after 1862 creating smaller amounts of Indian land scrip and other compensatory scrip, part of which possessed the special privilege of being subject to location on any part of the public domain, whether or not it was surveyed or had been offered for sale.[46]

The existence of large areas of rich lands open to speculative entries and the availability of warrants and scrip at depreciated prices made possible large-scale engrossment after the Homestead Law was passed. Some of the richest and most fertile sections of Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska, Missouri, California, Washington, and Oregon were thus open to cash or warrant entry and after the adoption of the Homestead Law they were quickly engrossed by speculators.

Some of the land entries[47] made after 1862 are interesting to note. Senator John Sherman, who, like most politicians of his day, was not averse to speculating in lands, located with Agricultural College scrip 2560 acres in Missouri in 1868; Robert Mears with the same kind of scrip located 29,280 acres in the Boonville district of Missouri; Amos Lawrence, prominent among the promoters of the Emigrant Aid Company at an earlier date, located 58,360 acres in Kansas in 1866 with Agricultural College scrip; Charles and Henry Stebbins and Henry M. Porter entered 53,760 acres in Kansas and Nebraska in 1866, 1867, and 1868 with the same kind of scrip; John C. Work and Rufus Hatch of New York, John J. Blair of New Jersey, and James C. Cusey of Sioux City, Iowa, entered in western Iowa in 1869 and 1870 12,200, 28,671, 20,970,

[45] Of course the Southern states did not receive their scrip until after the Civil War but it took some time for the Land Office to handle the details involved in issuing it and consequently most of it was located between 1864 and 1868. The price which each state received for the sale of its scrip is given in *History of the Agricultural College Land Grant of July 2, 1862, together with a Statement of the Conditions of the Fund derived therefrom as it now exists in each State of the Union* (Ithaca, 1890), pp. xvi, xvii.

[46] G.L.O. *Report*, 1875, p. 69; *Public Land Statutes of the United States*, Daniel M. Greene, compiler (Washington, 1931), pp. 637-639.

[47] These land entries were compiled from hundreds of volumes of abstracts in the General Land Office, Department of the Interior, Washington, the listing of which would be almost impossible and equally futile. Following are the chief types of entry books: Abstracts of Lands Entered (for cash), Military Warrant Abstracts, Agricultural College Scrip Abstracts, Indian and other miscellaneous scrip abstracts, and Registers of Receipts.

and 9280 acres respectively; John P. Crothers, of Berks County, Pennsylvania, later of Clark County, Ohio, entered with scrip and cash 44,140 acres in Nebraska; William Scully, one of the greatest landed proprietors in the United States whose relations with his tenants have been the subject of much hostile comment and legislation,[48] purchased for cash in a single land district in Nebraska in 1870, 41,421 acres; Ira Davenport of Steuben County, New York, whose land operations extended throughout most of the Northwestern states entered with cash and land warrants 16,949 acres in the Dakota City district of Nebraska. Perhaps the largest purchasers of land in Nebraska were a group of Providence, Rhode Island, speculators, consisting of Robert H. Ives, John Carter Brown, Charlotte R. and Moses B. J. Goddard. Ives alone had previously purchased 82,431 acres in Illinois, 50,000 acres in Iowa, and smaller amounts in Minnesota and Missouri, while Brown had acquired over 30,000 acres in Iowa and Illinois. These four individuals entered with cash over 96,000 acres in the Dakota City district. Between 1862 and 1873, twenty-seven other persons entered a combined area of 250,000 acres in Nebraska. Numerous other illustrations could be cited to indicate that speculation in agricultural lands in the Great Plains area did not cease with the passage of the Homestead Law.

Not only were the best agricultural lands being snapped up by speculators but the richest timber lands remaining in the possession of the United States were being rapidly entered by large dealers during the post-Civil War period. There were three areas in which vast amounts of timber land were still owned by the Federal government, the Lake states, the Gulf states with Arkansas, and the Pacific Coast states. In each of these three regions millions of acres of pine, spruce, hemlock, and fir were available for cash entry and in the Pacific area lands covered with the rich redwood and other trees peculiar to that region had been or were just being brought into the market. In the timber lands of these three sections some of the largest purchases by speculators or lumber men took place. Many thousands of acres in Wisconsin and Michigan were located by Isaac Stephenson, Philetus Sawyer, and Russell A. Alger, influential lumber dealers, who were subsequently to become members of the Senate of the United States. Ezra Cornell located 385,780 acres in the Eau Claire, Wisconsin, land district, 76,180 acres in the Bayfield district, 29,200 in the Stevens Point district, 12,480 acres in Minnesota, and 4000 acres in Kansas, all with Agricultural College scrip of New York. A group of New York magnates, Thomas F. Mason, George B.

[48] See C. F. Taylor, ed., *The Land Question from Various Points of View* (Philadelphia, 1898), pp. 44, *passim*.

Satterlee, and William E. Dodge, entered 232,799 acres in the Marquette, Michigan, district, 10,850 acres elsewhere in that state, and 10,359 acres in Wassau, Wisconsin. Francis Palms purchased in Wisconsin and Michigan 286,208 acres, and with Frederick E. Driggs entered in the eighties about 200,000 acres more in the Marquette district. Three Ithaca, New York, lumber dealers, Henry W. Sage,[49] John McGraw, and Jeremiah W. Dwight, like Ezra Cornell benefactors of Cornell University, entered 277,000 acres in Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota, and 75,000 acres in Mississippi, Alabama, and Arkansas. Other large timberland entrymen in the Northwest were Calvin F. Howe of New York who acquired 105,000 acres in Minnesota, Thomas B. Walker[50] who alone and with others acquired 166,000 acres in the St. Cloud, Minnesota, district, George M. Wakefield who accumulated 110,000 acres in the Marquette district, and Jesse Spaulding and H. H. Porter of Chicago who purchased 113,000 acres in the same district. Fifty-six other persons purchased a total of 1,514,000 acres in Michigan, mostly in the Marquette district.

The same concentration of ownership of timber lands developed in the South after 1877. Some of the large purchases in this section were Daniel F. Sullivan's purchase of 147,000 acres in the Montgomery, Alabama, district in 1880-1882; Jabez B. Watkins's purchase of 145,000 acres in the New Orleans district; Delos A. Blodgett's purchase of 136,000 acres in the Jackson, Mississippi, district in 1885 to 1888; Lutcher and Moore's purchase of 108,000 acres in Louisiana in the eighties; and Franklin Head's and Nathan B. Bradley's purchases of 110,000 and 111,200 acres respectively in the New Orleans district. Sixty-eight other persons entered 2,110,000 acres in the Southern districts. Altogether, over five and one half million acres of land were sold in the five Southern states between 1880 and 1888, exclusive of pre-emption sales. Practically all of this area went to large land and lumber dealers. These lands comprised some of the very choicest timbered areas in the South and within less than a generation were selling at prices which brought enormous profits to the owners. It is worthy of note that many of the large timber dealers in Wisconsin, Michigan, and Minnesota made great acquisitions in the South.

The engrossment of timber and agricultural lands on the Pacific

[49] The land empire of Henry W. Sage alone is said by a local historian to have included over 500,000 acres. John H. Selkreg, ed., *Landmarks of Tompkins County, New York* (Syracuse, 1894), pt. 2, p. 4.

[50] Walker acquired 700,000 acres of valuable sugar pine and western pine timber land in California, chiefly through the use of dummy entrymen. Bureau of Corporations, *The Lumber Industry*, pt. 2, p. 91.

Coast proceeded at an even more rapid rate than in other sections of the country. Here in the years immediately following the Civil War a relatively small group of speculators sought to monopolize the best timber and agricultural lands. A group of Eastern speculators consisting of W. W. Corcoran of Washington, ex-Senator Bright of Indiana, and Elisha and Lawrason Riggs, whose land acquisitions in the Middle West had been very profitable, purchased over 7000 acres in Washington and Oregon in the early seventies; another group of San Francisco speculators purchased 59,000 acres in the Olympia, Washington, district; J. W. Sprague of Minnesota purchased 24,000 acres in the same district, and five other persons acquired 42,000 acres. More spectacular were the huge entries in California.

Land monopolization in California dates back to the Spanish and Mexican periods when large grants were made to favored individuals. After investigation by an American commission, 588 of these claims amounting to 8,850,143 acres, or an average of 15,051 acres each, were confirmed.[51] Following 1848 there came a rapid influx of settlers which, together with the large profits realized from the grazing industry in the interior valleys, created a land boom and led to extensive purchases. With great areas of land in the San Joaquin and Sacramento valleys open to cash purchase the opportunity for speculative profits was unparalleled elsewhere; nor was the opportunity neglected. From 1862 to 1880 land sales and warrant and scrip entries in California were on an enormous scale, surpassing all other states for the period and in some years comprising well over half of the sales for the entire country. In the single year, ending June 30, 1869, 1,726,794 acres were sold in this state by the Federal government, and for the entire period from 1862 to 1880 well over 7,000,000[52] acres were entered with cash, warrants, or scrip. It should also be remembered that the State of California which received 8,426,380[53] acres from the Federal government was disposing of its most valuable holdings at this time.

Greatest of all the speculators operating in California was William S. Chapman whose political influence stretched from Sacramento to St. Paul, Minnesota, and Washington, D. C. Of him it was said, with apparent justice, that land officers, judges, local legislators, officials in the Department of the Interior, and even higher dignitaries were ready and anxious to do him favors, frequently of no mean significance. Between 1868 and 1871 Chapman entered at the Federal land offices ap-

[51] "Report of the Public Lands Commission", 1905, *op. cit.*, p. 140.

[52] G.L.O. *Reports*, 1862-1880.

[53] G.L.O. *Report*, 1932, p. 46.

proximately 650,000 acres of land in California and Nevada with cash, scrip, and warrants. At the same time he entered additional land through dummy entrymen, purchased many thousands of acres of "swamp" lands from the State of California, and otherwise added to his possessions till they totaled over 1,000,000 acres. Fraud, bribery, false swearing, forgery, and other crimes were charged against him but he passed them off with little trouble.[54] The most remarkable feature about his vast acquisitions is that when plotted on a land-use map today they appear to be among the choicest of the lands. Chapman was not able to retain this vast empire for long. He became deeply involved in a grand canal project and eventually lost his lands, many of them going to a more constructive but equally spectacular land plunger, Henry Miller.[55]

Miller, unlike Chapman, bought lands for his cattle business which was his main interest. As the activities of his firm—Miller and Lux, of which he was the chief promoter—expanded, he pushed its land acquisitions until they mounted to over a million acres. One hundred and eighty-one thousand acres of this amount were acquired directly from the Federal government, with cash, Agricultural College scrip, and military warrants; large amounts were purchased from Chapman and other big land speculators and from the State of California. Miller's lands were slowly irrigated, parts were disposed of to small farmers, and upon them today exists a veritable agricultural empire.[56]

Other large purchasers of land in California were Isaac Friedlander, E. H. Miller, and John W. Mitchell, who acquired 214,000, 105,000, and 78,000 acres respectively. The total amount purchased from the Federal government by Chapman, Miller and Lux, Friedlander, E. H. Miller, and Mitchell was one and a quarter million acres. Forty-three other large purchasers acquired 905,000 acres of land in the sixties in California. Buying in advance of settlement, these men were virtually thwarting the Homestead Law in California where, because of the enormous monopolization above outlined, homesteaders later were able to find little good land.

Further details concerning the widespread speculative activity in public lands—both agricultural and timbered—after the passage of the

[54] There is a mass of testimony offered to prove these charges in *Reports of the Joint Committees on Swamp and Overflowed Lands, and Land Monopoly,* presented at the Twentieth Session of the Legislature of California (Sacramento, 1874).

[55] Edward F. Treadwell, *The Cattle King* (New York, 1931), p. 73.

[56] The story of Henry Miller is interestingly told in Treadwell, *op. cit.* A more detailed and objective study of the land and cattle business of Miller and Lux would shed much light on the history of the Far West.

Homestead Act are unnecessary; it is clear that speculation and land engrossment were not retarded by the act. Homeseekers in the West, being unwilling to go far afield from means of transportation or to settle upon the inferior lands remaining open to homestead, and lacking capital with which to purchase farms and to provide equipment for them, were frequently forced to become tenants on the lands of speculators. Thus farm tenancy developed in the frontier stage at least a generation before it would have appeared had the homestead system worked properly. In the states of Kansas and Nebraska, in which large-scale land monopolization has been revealed, sixteen and eighteen per cent respectively of the farms were operated by tenants in 1880, the first year for which figures are available, and in 1890 twenty-eight and twenty-four per cent respectively were operated by tenants.[57] This continued monopolization of the best lands and the resulting growth of farm tenancy led reformers and others who feared the establishment of a landed aristocracy similar to that existing in many European countries to advocate the ending of the cash sales system entirely. Their demands were expressed in petitions to Congress, agitation in the press, and union of effort with other antimonopoly groups which were coming into prominence in the last third of the nineteenth century. Their agitation and the growing seriousness of the monopoly movement led to a series of halting steps toward the abandonment of cash sales, which frequently were offset by movements in the opposite direction.

The first step in the direction of abolishing the cash sale system was taken in June, 1866, when Congress provided that all public lands in the five Southern states of Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Louisiana, and Mississippi should be reserved from sale and subject only to entry under the Homestead Law.[58] The avowed purpose of this apparent discrimination against land speculation in the South while it was permitted to flourish elsewhere, was to prevent speculators from monopolizing the land when it was restored to market—all land transactions had of course ceased in these states during the Civil War—and to encourage the growth of small holdings among the freedmen. By the South, the act was regarded, perhaps rightly, as a punitive measure. Certain it is that much of the 46,398,544 acres[59] thus reserved from cash entry was unsuited to

[57] *Eleventh Census*, 1890, "Statistics of Agriculture", p. 4. There is some detail on the relation of land policy and farm tenancy in an article by the present writer on "Recent Land Policies of the Federal Government" which is to appear in part VII of the Supplementary Report of the Land Planning Committee to the National Resources Board, entitled "Certain Aspects of Land Problems and Governmental Land Policies".

[58] Act of June 21, 1866, 14 *U. S. Stat.*, 66-67.

[59] *Cong. Globe*, 39 Cong., 1 sess., pp. 715 ff.; p. 2736.

small-scale farming and the freedmen showed no great desire to take advantage of the homestead privilege thus safeguarded. Nevertheless, the act was the first attack on the cash sale system.

Two backward steps were tried the same year, however. In the same month that the law was passed restricting Southern public lands to homestead entry an apparently innocuous measure slipped through Congress without much debate or opposition, giving to the New York and Montana Iron Mining and Manufacturing Company the right to purchase at $1.25 per acre twenty sections—12,800 acres—of unsurveyed and unopened lands in the territory of Montana, three sections of which might contain iron ore or coal and the remaining sections would presumably be timber lands. This measure was put through by Benjamin Wade of Ohio and Thaddeus Stevens of Pennsylvania of whom it cannot be said that the interests of the homesteaders were nearest to their hearts.[60] It gave a gross extension of privilege to a group of speculators or land monopolists. Never had such a *carte blanche* grant been made before, though frequently petitioned for, and it aroused the indignation of President Johnson who, in a ringing veto message, declared that the privileges conferred by the act "are in direct conflict with every principle heretofore observed in respect to the disposal of the public lands".[61] If the measure had been signed, the principle of granting lands free or for the minimum price to mining companies and other industrial organizations might have been established and the remaining portion of the public domain might have been divided among such capitalistic groups, just as millions of acres were being parceled out among the railroads. In placing himself squarely against the law, President Johnson aided in preserving the lands from speculators.

President Johnson's opposition to the granting of such special privileges to private business groups did not end the matter, however, for a similar measure passed the Senate in 1870. This second measure would have authorized the Sierra Iron Company of California to purchase 640 acres of land containing iron ore in the vicinity of Gold Lake, California, and 3200 acres of timber lands for $2.50 per acre. As originally proposed by Senator Cole of California it would have permitted the purchase of 10,000 acres of timber lands at $1.25 per acre but was amended as above. The measure was rushed through the Senate at a night session when there was a very small attendance, but was later reconsidered, amended to provide further safeguards, and sent to the House where the opponents

[60] *Ibid.*, pp. 2193, 2218, 2219, 2303, 2965, 2966.

[61] Message of June 15, 1866, *Senate Journal*, 39 Cong., 1 sess., p. 532.

of land monopoly succeeded in preventing its adoption.[62] Eternal vigilance on the part of true friends of the homesteaders was essential to prevent such laws being slipped through without adequate consideration.

The second backward step was a series of Indian treaties and administrative measures by which substantial areas of land in the Great Plains were sold to railroad companies and other speculative groups. When railroads were projected through Kansas and Nebraska, it was found that they must run through Indian reservations. Congressional land grants did not apply to such lands and the railroad officials therefore sought to purchase the lands which they could not receive as a gift. Instead of asking for alternate sections, however, as in the grants, they sought to purchase solid areas which would enable them to secure the entire benefits resulting from the construction of the railroads. As the Granger period had not yet arrived, railroads were still popular throughout most sections of the country. Furthermore, they possessed great influence at the seat of power and it was not difficult for them to prevail upon the proper officials to make treaties for the cession or sale of Indian lands. The Senate at this time was far more friendly to the railroads than to the homeseekers, as shown by its generous land grants and financial subsidies to the former and its refusal to place restrictions upon speculative purchases of land. Apparently it saw little difference between making donations of alternate sections of the public domain to the railroads and selling solid blocks of Indian lands to them for a low price. It therefore ratified such treaties with little hesitation.

In the years immediately following the enactment of the Homestead Law, a number of such treaties and subsequent sales contracts were ratified, providing for the sale of several million acres in Kansas to railroad companies.[63] That which aroused the greatest local opposition was the sale of some 800,000 acres of Cherokee Indian lands in southeastern Kansas. A treaty was negotiated with the Cherokees which permitted the sale of 800,000 acres to a single individual or corporation for $1.00 per acre, and which completely disregarded the white settlers already on the lands. Before ratification, the treaty was amended to permit the sale of tracts of 160 acres to the squatters.[64] In the meantime, the Secretary of the Interior had sold this great tract to the American Emigrant Com-

[62] *Ibid.*, 41 Cong., 2 sess., pp. 3659-3670, 4543-4546.

[63] These treaties are included in *United States Statutes-at-Large*, vols. XII, XIII, XIV. They are analyzed and the areas conveyed by them are pictured on maps in Charles C. Royce, *Indian Land Sessions in the United States* (Eighteenth Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology to the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, 1896-1897), pt. 2.

[64] 14 *U. S. Stat.*, 799-809.

pany. This company was organized to operate under the nefarious contract labor law of 1864 but quickly saw that larger profits were to be realized in land speculation and it began to deal in lands. Its record of land deals is obscure but is accompanied by sufficient evidence to indicate that the transactions were not always legitimate.[65] The purchase of 800,000 acres of Cherokee lands at $1.00 per acre on long credit was the result of secret negotiations; the lands were not offered at public sale, and the settlers were given no opportunity to purchase the tracts upon which they were squatting. The sale was, then, an outrageous violation of the principle of land for the landless and was immediately attacked as a gross fraud upon the public. Subsequent investigations revealed much that could not be satisfactorily explained and the Attorney General held that it was not in conformity with the treaty with the Cherokees.

Meantime, the Cherokee tract, through widely circulated rumors as to its fertility and desirability for settlement, was attracting the attention of many interested people. Following 1866 settlers flocked to the area in large numbers so that by 1867 there were reported to be 10,000 or 12,000 people there [66] and the number was shortly increased to 20,000. The settlers expected from the government the same lenient attitude toward their intrusions upon land not open to settlement as was being rendered to other people in similar circumstances elsewhere. Unfortunately for them the value of the tract was appreciated by a number of railroad groups which desired to secure ownership of the entire area as a means of financing the construction of their lines. Concrete proposals for the purchase of the tract were made by three railroads—the Tebo and Neosho Railroad Company of Missouri,[67] the Atlantic and Pacific Railroad, and the Kansas City, Fort Scott, and Gulf Railroad. Prominent Missouri and Kansas politicians, John C. Fremont and James F. Joy—"The Railroad King"—were interested in these lines and each sought to secure the much coveted lands for his company. Although not the highest bidder, the sale was finally awarded to James F. Joy who purchased the land for the Kansas City, Fort Scott, and Gulf Railroad. After the sale was made and the rival proposals turned down, the lenient officials of the Department of the Interior permitted Joy to

[65] The sale of 18,000 acres of "swamp lands" in Wright County, Iowa, to the American Emigrant Company for $1500 and the subsequent recovery of a portion of the land is described by W. J. Covil in the Webster City *Freeman-Tribune*, July 13, 1904, republished in *Annals of Iowa*, 3d ser., VII (1905), 360.

[66] Governor S. J. Crawford, Topeka, Kansas, Aug. 19, 1867, to Secretary Browning, file of material on Indian land sales, Indian Office.

[67] P. A. Ladue, St. Louis, Missouri, Jan. 19, 1867, to L. C. Bogy, commissioner of Indian Affairs, *ibid.*

surrender his contract and to substitute the original but less exacting contract with the American Emigrant Company which was now assigned to him. This necessitated a supplementary treaty with the Cherokees to validate a contract previously held to be illegal. The contract was modified, however, to permit settlers who resided upon the land in 1866 to purchase their tracts at the appraised value.[68] Joy was required to pay but $1.00 an acre and generous credit was allowed him, while the settlers were asked to pay an average of $1.92 per acre in cash.[69]

The second sale was an equally great violation of the principle of free homesteads, and, it should be noted, was ratified by the Senate the same year that the House resolution frowning upon the further sale of agricultural land was passed. Secretary Browning who, as Harlan's successor, had negotiated the sale, came in for as bitter accusations as had his predecessor and, it must be admitted, with some justification. The sale was made to his brother-in-law, Joy; his partner was at the time employed by Joy to negotiate the transaction; Browning himself had earlier represented Joy, and the following year was again retained by him in a series of important cases.[70] Furthermore, as was pointed out in a joint resolution adopted by the House on July 13, 1868,[71] the sale failed to consider the rights of a large number of people who had settled upon the tract between 1866 and 1868 and who were subsequently forced to purchase their lands from the railroad. Petitions from settlers upon the Cherokee tract demanding the abrogation of the sale poured in upon the Interior Department;[72] the governor of Kansas denounced the sale as "a cheat and a fraud in every particular, and should have been encircled with hell's blackest marks", a "gigantic swindle";[73] and in 1868 both the Republican and Democratic state conventions condemned the policy

[68] The sale of the Cherokee lands is discussed in a letter of Charles Mix, acting commissioner of Indian Affairs, Apr. 21, 1869, to J. D. Cox, secretary of the Interior, Cherokee File, Indian Office. Secretary Harlan's interpretation of the sale may be read in *Cong. Globe*, 40 Cong., 3 sess., pp. 409 ff., and 41 Cong., 1 sess., pp. 21-23; also in Johnson Brigham, *James Harlan* (Iowa City, 1913), pp. 235 ff. See also Eugene F. Ware, "The Neutral Lands", Kansas State Historical Society, *Transactions*, VI (1900), 147-169.

[69] *Report*, Commissioner of Indian Affairs, 1869, p. 502.

[70] Theodore Calvin Pease and James G. Randall, eds., *Diary of Orville Hickman Browning* (Illinois State Historical Library, *Collections*, vols. XX, XXII, 1925-1933), I, 645-646; II, 219, 239, 257, 276, *passim*.

[71] *Cong. Globe*, 40 Cong., 2 sess., pp. 4000-4001.

[72] These petitions are filed in the Indian Office, Cherokee File.

[73] Samuel J. Crawford, *Kansas in the Sixties* (Chicago, 1911), p. 310. Crawford, as governor, took an active part in the campaign to end the sale of large tracts of Indian lands to railroads and other speculative groups. Aside from his interest in the settlers who were being deprived of the right of buying their holdings directly from the government he opposed the Indian land policy on the ground that it deprived the state of the 16th and 32d sections which it would otherwise get for its public schools.

of disposing of Indian lands to "speculators and foreign corporations".[74] The campaign to have the second sale annulled was unsuccessful but, combined with the opposition to similar sales of Indian lands, it was eventually to end the policy.

Equally inconsiderate of the rights of settlers were the sales of the lands of the Delaware, Pottawatomie, Kickapoo, and Sac and Fox of the Mississippi Indians in Kansas. Treaties authorizing the sale of the surplus Delaware and Pottawatomie lands to the Leavenworth, Pawnee, and Western Railroad for $1.25 per acre were proclaimed on August 22, 1860, and April 19, 1862, respectively.[75] This railroad was unable to carry through the purchase of the Pottawatomie lands but did succeed in negotiating a sufficiently liberal contract for the Delaware lands whereby it acquired title to 223,966 acres of rich farming lands in Leavenworth, Atchison, and Jefferson counties for $286,742 paid in its own bonds, instead of cash as originally required.[76] In 1866, the Delaware Indians having decided to abandon their diminished reserve in Kansas, which had been allotted in severalty, accepted a second treaty which provided for the sale of the 92,598 acres contained in the reserve to the Missouri River Railroad for $2.50 per acre, exclusive of improvements, which were to be appraised and sold at a fair valuation.[77]

The Pottawatomie lands were subsequently sold, in 1868, to the Atchison, Topeka, and Santa Fe Railroad. This sale called for the payment of $1.00 per acre, not $1.25 as the earlier treaty provided, and five years' time was given during which no payments were required except advance interest of six per cent annually upon the purchase sum. The government thus not only denied to settlers the right to acquire the land directly but gave the railroad company the use of 340,180 acres of rich agricultural lands for annual payments of $20,410 for five years. At the end of this time a payment of $340,180 was required, which could be paid in greenbacks.[78] The policy of making land sales to settlers on credit had been abandoned in 1820 and Congress had resisted all efforts to restore the credit system but credit was extended to railroads in the sixties. The Atchison, Topeka, and Santa Fe Railroad proceeded to sell the lands at prices well over double their cost, and charged seven per cent

[74] D. W. Wilder, *Annals of Kansas* (Topeka, 1886), pp. 481, *passim*. In this book are found a number of items indicating the emotions which were aroused in the settlers of the Cherokee tract by the arbitrary sale of the lands.

[75] 12 *U. S. Stat.*, 1129, 1193. This railroad later became the Union Pacific Railway Company, Eastern Division, and still later the Kansas Pacific Railroad.

[76] *Ibid.*, p. 1177.

[77] 14 *U. S. Stat.*, 793-794; O. H. Browning, secretary of the Interior, Oct. 21, 1867, to C. E. Mix, commissioner of Indian Affairs, Delaware Files, Indian Office.

[78] 15 *U. S. Stat.*, 535-536; *Report*, Commissioner of Indian Affairs, 1869, p. 504.

interest on delayed payments. By 1873 it had received in cash and notes $646,784 and valued the remaining lands at $507,366,[79] no small profit for the times. A substantial part of the amount due the government in 1873 was paid from cash sales. The mortgage bonds based on these lands, obtained for only $20,410 down, enabled the railroad to begin construction without the promoters having to supply any capital of their own worth mentioning.

A treaty similar to that with the Pottawatomie Indians was concluded with the Kickapoo Indians under the terms of which 123,832 acres were sold in 1865 to the Atchison and Pike's Peak Railroad for $1.25 per acre, on generous credit.[80] This treaty was negotiated with a railroad whose president, Samuel C. Pomeroy, was not only senator from Kansas and thus in a position to support its adoption, but was also very close to the administration of the Indian Office and the Department of the Interior. Pomeroy represented the attitude of his state in demanding the speedy removal of the Indians and the disposal of their lands but he went against popular opinion in supporting the sale of the Cherokee, Delaware, Pottawatomie, Kickapoo, and Osage lands to railroads.

The sale of the Sac and Fox Indian lands differs somewhat from those previously mentioned. These lands, comprising 272,200 acres, were advertised for sale to the highest bidders but, unlike the public land auctions, the bids were to be submitted by letter. This of course had the effect of preventing settlers upon the lands from combining into a claims association and preventing outsiders from bidding as was done at the public auctions. As a result most of the land was acquired at low prices by speculators, among whom the largest buyers were John McManus,[81] William B. McKean, Fuller and McDonald, Robert S. Stevens, and the Hon. Hugh McCulloch who acquired respectively 142,915, 29,677, 39,058, 51,689, and 7014 acres.[82]

The treaty providing for the largest sale of Indian lands was negotiated in 1868 between the Osage Indians of Kansas and representatives of the Department of the Interior, according to which 8,000,000 acres of land were to be sold to the Leavenworth, Lawrence, and Galveston

[79] *Report,* Atchison, Topeka, and Santa Fe Railroad, 1873, p. 10. It is true that in later reports the meager data given indicate the estimate of return contained in the *Report* for 1873 as somewhat optimistic.

[80] 13 *U. S. Stat.,* 623 ff.; *Cong. Globe,* 40 Cong., 2 sess., p. 1715; Royce, *passim.*

[81] John McManus, of Reading, Pennsylvania, was a director of the Kansas Pacific Railway Company which had the largest land grant in Kansas. *Report,* Kansas Pacific Railway Co., 1870.

[82] *Report,* Commissioner of Indian Affairs, 1865, p. 549 ff. See also speech of Representative Julian in *Cong. Globe,* 40 Cong., 2 sess., p. 1715.

Railroad for $1,600,000.[83] This was at the rate of twenty cents an acre for lands to which settlers were eagerly looking for homes. Characterized by Governor Crawford as "one of the most infamous outrages ever before committed in this country", it was indeed a most disgraceful and unjustified action. If adopted it would have deprived the State of Kansas of 500,000 acres of school lands, robbed the Indians of a fair price for their lands, and would have killed a number of rival railroads, including the Atchison, Topeka, and Santa Fe. Worst of all, the treaty ignored the rights of settlers already on the lands. Furthermore, it was stated that a substantially higher bid had been turned down in order to accept that of the Leavenworth, Lawrence, and Galveston Railroad. The hand of James F. Joy was again seen, for the latter road had already come under his control as part of the great transportation system he was constructing. The Osage treaty brought to a climax the utter disregard shown by the officials of the Department of the Interior for the rights of settlers and aroused a storm of criticism, both in Kansas and in Washington.[84]

Representative George W. Julian, than whom no one had the interests of the homesteader more at heart, saw the iniquity in these Indian treaties and subsequent land sales to railroads and others. He introduced a resolution into the House of Representatives to the effect that these sales were a usurpation of power by the Senate which was endangering the entire land system and urged upon the Senate the advisability of ratifying no more such treaties. He pointed out that by using the treaty making power in this way it was possible for the Senate to transfer all the public lands to the Indians and then by other treaties to arrange for their sale to railroads or other speculative groups, thus completely frustrating the Homestead Law and subverting the land system. Julian succeeded in winning the support of the House for his view and the resolution was adopted.[85] The enactment of this resolution and the storm of criticism which rained upon the Senate apparently had some effect, for the treaty with the Osage Indians, although urgently supported by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, was not ratified and Congress later provided for the sale of the Osage lands to actual settlers.

One may plainly see from events in Congress during 1867 and 1868 how insincere that body was in rendering lip service to the homestead principle. In this year Representative Julian introduced two measures

[83] *Report*, Commissioner of Indian Affairs, 1868, p. 5.

[84] Crawford, pp. 299 ff.

[85] *Cong. Globe*, 40 Cong., 2 sess., pp. 2753, 2814, 3278-3279.

into the House, the action on which throws a flood of light on the question. The first was a resolution that:

> In order to carry into full and complete effect the spirit and policy of the preëmption and homestead laws of the United States, the further sale of the agricultural public lands ought to be prohibited by law and that all proposed grants of land to aid in construction of railroads, or for other special objects, should be carefully scrutinized and rigidly subordinated to the paramount purpose of securing homes for the landless poor, the actual settlement and tillage of the public domain, and the consequent increase of the national wealth.[86]

The second was a bill to prevent any further sale of the public lands except as provided for in the Pre-emption and Homestead laws.[87] In support of these measures Julian made a number of strong speeches in which he described the evils resulting from speculation in lands, showed that, except for the Southern states, free homesteading was restricted to the least attractive lands, and denounced the land monopoly which was rapidly being created by the lavish grants to the railroads. Julian was followed by two congressmen from Michigan districts in which lumbering was the chief industry. They favored large grants to railroads and no restrictions on land sales, and argued that Julian's bill, if passed, would ruin the lumber industry, increase speculation and fraudulent entries, and thus frustrate its own purpose.[88] Although unanimously reported by the Committee on Public Lands, nothing further was heard from the bill to end cash sales. The resolution, on the other hand, which had no binding effect but which favored exactly the same policy toward cash sales as the bill, passed the House without any important opposition.[89] Congress was far from ready in 1868 to end cash sales, and the passage of the resolution was certainly not "tantamount to a law".[90]

Between the enactment of this resolution in 1868 and 1876, the forces interested in opening up the public domain to large-scale purchases were fighting the advocates of the homestead principle on two grounds; they struggled to repeal the Act of 1866 which placed restrictions on cash sales in the South, and they tried to prevent further limitations on land engrossment in the West.

The discriminatory character of the restrictions upon cash sales in the South and its obviously punitive features rankled with the Southern congressmen who sought to repeal the act of 1866. They were vigorously supported by representatives from other sections who were either interested in the lumber industry themselves or whose constituents looked with longing eyes upon the rich pine lands of the South. In the early

[86] *Ibid.*, p. 97. [87] *Ibid.*, p. 371. [88] *Ibid.*, pp. 1712-1715, 2380-2387.
[89] *Ibid.*, p. 1861. [90] See p. 653 of this article.

seventies the movement for repeal gained headway. Its leaders harped on the discriminatory features of the Act of 1866, its retarding effects upon immigration and the lumber industry, and argued that it led to the public lands being stripped of their only valuable commodity—timber. In 1875 the commissioner of the General Land Office came to the support of the repealists. Indeed, the land commissioners in their reports of 1875, 1876, and 1877 favored opening up all public lands to cash sale.[91] Strong opposition was voiced against the repeal measure by the Northern radicals for political purposes and by land reformers who foresaw the effects of such a backward step, but the combination of Southern resentment and Northern economic interests was too strong, and the measure became a law on July 4, 1876, without the approval of President Grant.[92] Southern lands were again made subject to cash entry, the unfortunate results of which have already been seen in the large-scale monopolization by lumber interests, mostly from the Northern states.

Although defeated in the South, the land reformers, under the leadership of Senator Harlan of Iowa and Representative Julian of Indiana, continued the fight to limit or end cash sales to large purchasers. In the House three measures were passed in 1870, one to end cash sales in California, another to end cash sales in Dakota Territory, and the third to prevent cash sales in Nebraska, Nevada, California, Arkansas, and Utah.[93] Similar measures were introduced in the Senate but were uniformly unsuccessful, because here the interests of lumber men, mining groups, and large speculators were well represented. In 1872 a congressman from California proposed an amendment to the Constitution which would have prohibited the further disposal of the public lands except to actual settlers but it made no progress.[94]

From the date of the repeal of the restrictions on cash entry in the South until 1889 there was not a session of Congress in which the question of reserving all the public lands for homestead entry was not fiercely debated. Continued efforts were made to end the cash sale system. Following 1880, the Pre-emption, Timber and Stone, Timber Culture, and Desert Land acts came in for much criticism since it was apparent that, like the commutation clause of the Homestead Law, they lent themselves to abuse and fraud. In the eighties the movement was given a

[91] *Cong. Globe*, 41 Cong., 3 sess., pp. 539-540; *Cong. Record*, 43 Cong., 1 sess., pp. 4633, *passim*; 44 Cong., 1 sess., pp. 815 ff., 1090, 3655. G.L.O. *Report*, 1875, pp. 8-9, 17-19; 1876, p. 7; 1877, p. 34.

[92] *Cong. Record*, 44 Cong., 1 sess., p. 4469; 19 *U. S. Stat.*, 73-74. The debates on the repeal measure are discussed in Ise, pp. 49-53.

[93] *Cong. Globe*, 41 Cong., 2 sess., pp. 738-739, 5129.

[94] *Cong. Globe*, 42 Cong., 3 sess., p. 84.

great impetus by the discovery of enormous frauds in which foreign corporations and titled noblemen were engaged for the purpose of building up vast estates. The fact that most of this alien ownership was English [95] was used effectively by the Anglophobes and, added to the antimonopoly movement which was rapidly gaining in strength, it made easy the conversion of many politicians to the cause of land reform.

President Cleveland's land commissioner, William A. J. Sparks, dramatically brought the issue to the front by revealing with overwhelming evidence that "the public domain was being made the prey of unscrupulous speculation and the worst forms of land monopoly through systematic frauds carried on and consummated under the public land laws".[96] In cold, biting language, he accused the administration of the General Land Office of being either extraordinarily inept in its management or directly involved in the great frauds which he unearthed. So general were the illegal or fraudulent entries that within a month after his accession to office he suspended all final entries under the Timber and Stone Act and the Desert Land Act, and in Colorado, Dakota, Idaho, Utah, Washington, New Mexico, Montana, Wyoming, Nevada, and parts of Minnesota, Kansas, and Nebraska suspended all entries except those made with cash and scrip. The evidence of fraud continued to come in, and, as the demand for complete suspension of all non-homestead entries stimulated speculators and monopolists to feverish activity, Sparks in desperation, in 1886, ordered the land officers to accept no further applications for entries under the Pre-emption, Timber Culture, and Desert Land acts.[97] This precipitate action stirred up a veritable hornets' nest of opposition and the order was rescinded, but its effect remained.

The onslaught of the antimonopolists had the effect of stimulating the speculators, cattlemen, lumber and mining companies to prompt action before the public domain should be closed to them. Land sales and entries under the Pre-emption, Timber Culture, Timber and Stone, and Desert Land acts and the cash sale system shot up to a high point in 1888, exceeding those of any year since 1856 and being surpassed only four times in our entire history.

This enormous speculation, added to the widespread frauds which were being uncovered, produced a demand for reform which swelled to a tremendous volume. Hundreds of petitions with innumerable signatures flooded Congress urging changes in land policy and administra-

[95] In 1884 the Senate called for an investigation of the foreign land holdings and the resulting report contains some interesting information on the practices and holdings of a number of well-financed British land and cattle companies. See *Sen. Doc.*, 48 Cong., 1 sess., no. 181.

[96] G.L.O. *Report*, 1885, p. 48. [97] *Report*, 1886, p. 43, 135.

tion. They made it plain that public opinion had been aroused and could no longer be ignored.

Measure after measure providing for repeal of the objectionable laws passed the House in the eighties only to be defeated in the Senate. Finally, under the stimulus of Sparks's dramatic gesture, repeal measures passed both houses in 1886 and again in 1887, but were defeated through failure to harmonize conflicting views. These were to be the last defeats, however, because Congress was rapidly being forced into a position where it had to take action. In May and July, 1888, two measures were passed by which land sales in the five Southern states were temporarily suspended, and the Act of 1876 was reversed. This was followed, on March 2, 1889, by an act ending all cash sales of public lands except in Missouri where the remaining lands were mostly mineral in character or scattered fragments of little value for agriculture. In 1890 a rider was attached to an appropriation act by which it was stipulated that henceforth no person should acquire title to more than 320 acres in the aggregate under all of the land laws.[98] Finally, in 1891 a combination of anti-monopoly land reformers and conservationists placed upon the statute books a law which was as far reaching, as important, perhaps, as the Homestead Act of 1862. This law[99] repealed the Pre-emption and Timber Culture acts and placed additional safeguards in the Desert Land Act and the commutation clause of the Homestead Act. Except for Indian lands and small isolated tracts the speculators could no longer purchase whole counties for the minimum price and land engrossment by fraudulent means was at least made more difficult. Unfortunately these land reforms were not enacted until the best of the area suitable for farming without irrigation had passed into private ownership.

The most important section of the Act of 1891 was that which authorized the creation of forest reservations on the public lands. Here was the first fundamental break with the underlying philosophy of our land system—the desire to dispose of the lands and hasten their settlement. The conservationists had now convinced the country that a part of our natural resources must be retained in public ownership and preserved for the future. Unfortunately, conservation, when first adopted, was embedded in an outworn laissez-faire land system of a previous age just as the free homestead plan had been superimposed upon a land system designed to produce revenue. In both cases the old and the new clashed with disastrous effects.

PAUL WALLACE GATES.

Bucknell University.

[98] 25 *U. S. Stat.*, 622, 626; 854-855; 26 *U. S. Stat.*, 371, 391.
[99] 26 *U. S. Stat.*, 1095-1103.

THE OFFICIAL CHINESE ATTITUDE TOWARD THE BURLINGAME MISSION

THE first Chinese diplomatic mission to Europe and the United States, generally known as the Burlingame Mission, represented the earliest voluntary move on the part of the Chinese government to deal with Western nations in accord with practices generally accepted in the West. During the first half of the nineteenth century all efforts made by the representatives of Western countries to establish satisfactory diplomatic relations with the Chinese government were frustrated, the traditional Chinese conception of the absolute superiority of their civilization and the primacy of their emperor making intercourse on an equal basis impossible. The so-called Opium War was to a very large extent brought on by the friction resulting from the Chinese attitude of superiority and contempt toward foreigners. Although the British were victorious and dictated the terms of the Treaty of Nanking which was signed in 1842, they achieved only partial success, for while the treaty stipulated that diplomatic and consular officials should be treated as equals by Chinese provincial officials of corresponding rank, the capital remained closed to the residence of the foreign representatives.

During the early 1850's the foreign diplomats accredited to China, deciding that it was impossible to obtain satisfaction from the ultra-conservative Canton governor general—who alone was empowered to deal with them—determined to go directly to the authorities in Peking. Finding that this could not be peacefully achieved, Great Britain and France resorted to military force with the result that the Chinese government was finally forced to permit the establishment of foreign legations in the capital. To deal with them a foreign office was set up in 1861, although the foreign diplomats were not received personally by the emperor because of their refusal to kowtow in the manner required of all persons coming into his presence.

The Chinese were forced to accept the presence of the legations, but since they were not forced to reciprocate by sending their own diplomatic representatives, they made no effort to do so. When pressed on the subject by individual foreign diplomats, high Chinese dignitaries usually replied that it was the intention of their government eventually to send envoys abroad, but that such a step was too revolutionary to be taken at once. Furthermore, they argued, the Treaty Powers had commercial

and missionary interests in China which required the attention of diplomatic and consular representatives, but China had no such interests abroad to demand the presence of Chinese officials.[1]

The ministers of the foreign office, however, were constantly subjected to the arguments of foreigners who believed that China should be represented in foreign capitals. Certain foreign diplomats pushed the matter because they felt that China's reticence was due to her refusal to accept their countries as her equals. Other foreigners such as Robert Hart, inspector general of the Chinese Imperial Maritime Customs, Anson Burlingame, American minister to China, and W. A. P. Martin, a teacher in and later head of the T'ung-wên-kuan,[b] who were influential with the higher officials dealing with foreign affairs, urged the matter because they felt that representation abroad would be of great benefit to China.

Finally, in 1866, at the suggestion of Robert Hart who was returning to England for a short furlough, the ministers of the foreign office asked the emperor for permission to send with him three students of the T'ung-wên-kuan, accompanied by a retired official of low rank, to study conditions in Europe. Permission was granted and the Pin Ch'un[c] Mission was dispatched.[2] It had no diplomatic status, but it was well received in the nine European countries visited, and being the first mission of any kind to be sent to Europe in modern times, it established an important precedent.

Toward the middle of November, 1867, Anson Burlingame, who had been the American minister in China since 1862, called at the foreign office to bid Prince Kung[d] and the other ministers farewell in view of his intention to resign his post and return to the United States.[3] After considerable expression of good feeling and regret over his departure, the suggestion was made that he might serve the Chinese, as he had on a previous visit to the West, by doing what he could to explain China's intentions and to correct misapprehensions. In fact the principal Chinese ministers suggested that he might serve China officially in the capacity of an envoy.[4] The matter seems to have been brought up at the time

[1] *Ch'ou-pan i-wu shih-mo*[a] [*The Beginning and End of the Management of Barbarian Affairs*], (Peiping, Palace Museum, 1929–1931), T'ung Chih section, L, 32a, 2–4. This work, cited hereafter as *IWSM*, is a very full official compilation of documents relating to foreign affairs. The small letters refer to the Chinese characters at the end of the article.

[2] *IWSM*, XLVI, 17a-18a. The T'ung-wên-kuan was a school established in Peking in 1862 by the foreign office to teach foreign languages and later Western sciences.

[3] Burlingame to Secretary of State Seward, Dec. 14, 1867, *Papers relating to Foreign Affairs, 1868* (Washington, 1869), I, 494. This series is cited hereafter as *For. Rel.*

[4] *Ibid.*; *IWSM*, LI, 27b, 1–2; W. A. P. Martin, *A Cycle of Cathay* (2d ed., New York, 1897), p. 374.

rather incidentally, but in view of the rapidity with which the Chinese reached a decision, it is quite evident that they had had something of the kind under consideration for some time.[5]

Even though the suggestion that Burlingame be sent abroad as a Chinese envoy may have been made lightly, it soon became the subject of very serious consideration. The members of the foreign office report that they visited the American legation several times on the excuse of paying farewell visits and that each time the matter was discussed.[6] And although Burlingame states that he had no further conversations with the Chinese until they made him a formal offer, we know that in the interim he gave considerable thought to the matter and after discussing it with his friends, "determined, in the interests of our country and civilization, to accept".[7] The ministers of the foreign office formally offered Burlingame the post on November 18, and he accepted. On the 21st the following imperial rescript was handed down:

> The foreign office has memorialized to the effect that the minister, Anson Burlingame, is even-tempered in dealing with matters and is conversant with the general conditions of China and foreign countries. He is therefore appointed to go to the Treaty Powers as Minister for the Management of Chinese Diplomatic Relations with the Powers.[e] The other matters are to be carried out as recommended.[8]

In the same rescript in which Burlingame was appointed, another foreign office memorial was approved in which it was suggested that J. McLeavy Brown, acting Chinese secretary of the British legation, and E. de Champs, a Frenchman belonging to the Chinese Imperial Maritime Customs service, together with one or two Chinese officials, be appointed to accompany him. The memorial expresses a fear that England and France might be suspicious of the appointment of Burlingame as China's

[5] Hart informs us that he had discussed the matter of sending representatives abroad every time he had visited the foreign office during September and October, 1867, and that he had even been told by one of the ministers that they were considering appointing him to accompany whichever Chinese official should be chosen to go. Robert Hart, "Note on Chinese Matters", in Frederick Wells Williams, *Anson Burlingame and the First Chinese Mission to Foreign Powers* (New York, 1912), pp. 285–286.

[6] "We unfortunately have no men [*i.e.*, natives] to send abroad as envoys and since Burlingame desires to establish a reputation, and has resolutely volunteered for the responsibility, and since he is really sincere at heart, we have gone to his legation on successive days on the excuse of paying farewell visits to talk with him about this matter. [On those occasions] his words have been most noble and public-spirited." *IWSM*, LI, 27b, 3–5.

[7] *For. Rel., 1868*, I, 494. Martin (p. 375), who was very intimate with Burlingame, writes that the latter was much pleased by the possibilities which he could see in such a position; he felt that while it might delay, it might also help his political career.

[8] *IWSM*, LI, 28a, 4–5; 29a, 6–7.

diplomatic representative and states that attaching nationals of those countries to the mission should make them more willing to receive it. Brown's views are, in general, in accord with those of Burlingame, and De Champs has proved his dependability while accompanying the Pin Ch'un Mission; besides, both men are able to use the Chinese language. It was also thought that there should be one or two undersecretaries[f] of the foreign office attached to the mission to take charge of correspondence with that office and with whom Burlingame should consult concerning measures to be taken.[9]

On November 26 a rescript was handed down accepting a recommendation of the foreign office that Brown and De Champs be attached to the mission as First and Second secretaries respectively.[g] Brown had complained that without Chinese official rank he and De Champs would lack the prestige necessary to their function, so the foreign office compromised between its fear that too much power would make them dangerous and too little honor make them resentful by suggesting that they be given high-sounding titles but no official rank. On the same day another rescript [10] appointed Chih Kang[h] and Sun Chia-ku,[i] two undersecretaries of the foreign office, Ministers for the Management of Chinese Diplomatic Relations[j]—a title identical in meaning with that given Burlingame.

Two general reasons were given by the foreign office for the sending of this mission: namely, (1) that misunderstandings had resulted from the fact that foreign governments were in possession of full information concerning China, whereas the Chinese were abysmally ignorant of conditions in foreign countries, and (2) that China had no means of checking the improper actions of foreign ministers stationed in Peking since she did not have access to their superiors.[11]

A more special reason given for appointing Burlingame as China's representative to the Treaty Powers [12] at this time was that he might explain away the confusion existing in the West regarding China's actions and intentions. The foreign office felt that there were no Chinese

[9] *Ibid.*, 28b, 4–29a, 1.

[10] *Ibid.*, LII, 2a, 6–2b, 1; 5a, 10–6a, 1.

[11] *Ibid.*, LI, 27a, 3–6.

[12] Hosea Ballou Morse, *The International Relations of the Chinese Empire* (Shanghai, 1918), II, 188, says that Burlingame was "accredited to all the courts of the world", but this is not true. Furthermore, in the archives of the American legation in Peking we find the translation of a letter addressed by the Chinese foreign office to S. W. Williams, the American chargé d'affaires, dated Aug. 28, 1868, in which it is stated that the mission is to confine itself to the countries having treaty relations with China because, since it would be impossible to visit all non-treaty powers, if some were visited the others might resent being neglected. U. S. Legation Archives, China, no. 230, f. 515.

who were competent to do this, and it considered Burlingame honest and well intentioned. It pointed out that European countries had occasionally sent men who were not their own nationals as envoys, basing their choice upon trustworthiness rather than place of origin, and even China had found the services of Hart, an Englishman, in its Maritime Customs, entirely satisfactory. So it urged that China would undoubtedly profit more by sending Burlingame as its representative than it would by sending only Chinese.[13]

The impending revision of treaties was also a factor—possibly the most important one—in the sending of the Burlingame Mission, as was suggested by Williams at the time and also hinted at in the first foreign office memorial.[14] The Chinese were fearful that "progress", particularly in the form of concessions to foreigners, would be demanded of them, and that if these demands were not granted the powers would again resort to force. It was hoped that Burlingame would be able to persuade the governments to which the mission was accredited that China was progressing as rapidly as could be expected and that forbearance and patience on their parts were necessary.[15]

Anson Burlingame, while serving as American minister, had won the confidence and respect of the Chinese by his friendly and sympathetic attitude toward their government which was passing through a difficult period of readjustment to the new conditions arising out of the Anglo-French war of 1860 and the forced opening of the capital to the residence of foreign diplomatic representatives. The members of the foreign office, in recommending his appointment, spoke of his even temper and of his understanding of conditions both in China and abroad, and they recalled that he had supported them in the unfortunate matter of the Lay-Osborne Flotilla, and had exerted himself in an unofficial capacity to explain the Chinese position while on a previous visit to the West.[16] With his courtly and diplomatic manner, his honesty and breadth of vision, and his ability as an orator, he was the ideal man to send on such a mission as this.

Chih Kang, a Manchu, and Sun Chia-ku, a Chinese, had been employed as undersecretaries in the foreign office for several years, and were well acquainted with China's foreign relations. At the time of their appointment to accompany Burlingame, Chih Kang wore the

[13] *IWSM*, LI, 27b, 5–9.

[14] *For. Rel., 1868*, I, 496; *IWSM*, LI, 27b, 9–10.

[15] *For. Rel., 1868*, I, 495–496; Hart, "Note", *op. cit.*, p. 287; Martin, p. 376.

[16] For Burlingame's part in the settlement of this difficulty, see Martin, pp. 231–232; *IWSM*, LI, 27a, 7–10. For Burlingame's farewell interviews with members of the foreign office before going home on his first furlough, in 1865, see *For. Rel., 1865*, II, 445–449.

decoration of the peacock feather [17] and held the official position of an intendant of the Maritime Customs awaiting assignment to a post, and Sun held an honorary position as intendant of circuit and actual positions of prefect awaiting assignment to a major post and senior secretary of the Board of Rites. With their new appointment as envoys, both Chih Kang and Sun were elevated to the second official rank and Sun was given a peacock feather.[18]

In addition to Brown and De Champs, six students of the T'ung-wên-kuan were ordered to accompany the mission in the capacity of interpreters. They were Tê Ming (Chang Tê-i)[k] and Fêng I,[l] students in the English department who had accompanied Pin Ch'un to Europe, T'a K'ê Shih No[m] and Kuei Jung,[n] students in the Russian department, and Lien Fang[o] and T'ing Chün[p] of the French department. Four copyists of low official rank were also ordered to accompany the mission as were two minor military officers who were to act as orderlies. All of the Chinese attachés were elevated in rank in order to increase their prestige, and also, probably, to compensate them for having to spend some time away from China. A number of attendants and servants must have been added to the group, for Burlingame wrote to Secretary of State Seward before leaving China that his suite numbered about thirty persons.[19]

In examining the instructions and credentials of the mission, great care is necessary because of disagreements in the source materials. Professor F. W. Williams, whose book is considered the standard work on the Burlingame Mission, believed that no written instructions had been given Burlingame and that the foreign office note of December 7 to S. W. Williams and the other foreign representatives stationed in Peking "claims attention as the sole authorisation for action abroad vouchsafed by the Imperial Government to its Embassy".[20] While the authenticity of this note from the Chinese foreign office cannot be doubted, there is no copy of it in the *Ch'ou-pan i-wu shih-mo,* whereas there is in that compilation a set of written instructions to Burlingame which are very

[17] S. W. Williams to Seward, *For. Rel., 1868,* I, 495. The peacock feather was the principal form of decoration for public service during the Ch'ing dynasty.

[18] *IWSM,* LII, 1a, 3–5; 2a, 9–10.

[19] *Ibid.,* 6a–6b; *For. Rel., 1868,* I, 494.

[20] Williams, pp. 103–104. This document occurs in two translations in *For. Rel., 1868,* I. The first is that sent to the Department of State by S. W. Williams (pp. 499–500), and the second, made by Brown, was filed with the Department of State by the mission after its arrival in Washington (pp. 602–603). Although there are numerous superficial differences and a few important ones, these translations were obviously made from the same original; in Johannes von Gumpach, *The Burlingame Mission* (Shanghai, 1872), pp. 163–164, the original note (in Chinese) sent to the British minister is reproduced.

specific and which seem to have been entirely unknown to foreigners outside the mission and perhaps even to Burlingame himself.[21] Neither are there in the *Ch'ou-pan i-wu shih-mo* copies of the letters of credence, but there is a memorial from the foreign office requesting such letters, and a later memorial quoting a statement from the envoys to the effect that they had received the letters, so there seems to be no doubt that the emperor really issued the letters which were presented in the different capitals visited by the mission.[22]

The instructions given Burlingame by the foreign office, in which his powers and limitations are defined, were presented for "imperial inspection" on November 26, 1867. They point out, in the first place, that only those diplomatic dealings which will result in benefits both to China and to the country being dealt with are to be permitted, but that neither country shall resort to coercion in securing them. The foreign office has for a long time desired to have Chinese officials sent to the powers, but the lack of experienced men has made it impossible; now the Chinese government is sending Burlingame to the powers to manage matters just as if he were a Chinese official. It is necessary, however, to send Chinese officials with him in order that he may consult with them and that they may gain experience. These men being "imperially appointed officials" are, therefore, according to Chinese precedent, of equal rank with Burlingame and with any of the ministers of the powers with whom they may have dealings.[23] Furthermore all matters concerning

[21] It must be remembered that Burlingame knew no Chinese and that none of the responsible Chinese knew English; consequently he was entirely at the mercy of his non-Chinese interpreters. It seems impossible to say whether Burlingame knew of these instructions—which he certainly did not follow in any case; or whether Brown and perhaps Hart knew of their existence and kept him in ignorance; or whether the foreign office merely wrote them for the benefit of the conservatives about the Throne and then kept them to itself, or, even if it made them known to the members of the mission, orally informed them that they need not be followed.

[22] *IWSM*, LIV, 29b–31a; LVII, 35b, 3–6. Von Gumpach reproduces in his book (pp. 62–64) the Chinese and Manchu texts of the letter of credence addressed to the queen of England. A comparison of his Chinese text with the official translation (which is to be found in *For. Rel., 1868*, I, 601–602) leads one to the conclusion that Von Gumpach reproduces a true copy.

[23] In its note of Dec. 7, already referred to, the foreign office expresses a fear that the foreign ministers stationed in Peking will consider the "imperial appointment" of three men to mean that no one of them is to take the lead in dealing with the powers. This is not to be the case, however, for when the envoys reach a country where there are matters to be dealt with, conversations are to be carried on by Burlingame alone, for the Chinese government, and when a method of handling matters has been decided upon by Burlingame, Chih Kang and Sun Chia-ku shall notify the foreign office after consulting with him. Von Gumpach (Chinese text), pp. 163, 7–9; 164, upper half, 13–16. This statement seems to conflict with the terms of the first part of Burlingame's instructions, and so far as the writer can see there is no explanation of the disagreement. The difference is

the mission are to be discussed by Burlingame with his two co-envoys, in order that they may transmit the information to the foreign office for its approval.

After citing as a precedent Article III of the Anglo-Chinese Treaty of Tientsin,[24] which provides that the British diplomatic representative in China shall not be called upon to perform any ceremony derogatory to the dignity of his country, the foreign office instructs Burlingame to avoid, if possible, the customary audience granted to newly arrived diplomatic representatives in the West. If it cannot be avoided, he is told to make known his instructions on this point and to make arrangements whereby there shall be no formal ceremonies until some later date when articles of ceremony have been mutually agreed upon by China and the various powers. Article IV of the same treaty, guaranteeing diplomatic inviolability and the same treatment of diplomatic representatives as is accorded officers of the same rank by the laws of other countries, is also cited as a precedent for the mission, and Burlingame is requested to take charge of all matters pertaining to the transportation and residence of the party. He is informed that all expenses are to be met from Chinese funds.

Ordinary matters which are beneficial and not injurious are to be handled by Burlingame and his two colleagues, subject to the confirmation of the foreign office. In matters of great importance, however, the envoys are merely to draw up the particulars and inform the foreign office, leaving the decision to that body.[25] Official wooden seals are to be given Burlingame and his two co-envoys, but their use is to be limited to correspondence, for only the foreign office seal can give validity to acts or agreements. It is pointed out that the dispatch of this mission is an experiment and is quite different from the sending of permanent diplomatic representatives. The mission is to stay abroad only one year, but the foreign office promises that if on its return it is found that satis-

further emphasized in Brown's translation in which he interpolates into the text a phrase which cannot be found either in the Chinese original or in Williams's translation: "His Majesty in this appointment charged Mr. Burlingame, assisted by his secretaries, with the exclusive control and responsibility of the business of the Mission." *For. Rel., 1868*, I, 602. Certainly Burlingame does not give a true impression of the position of his two co-envoys when he writes to Secretary Seward that they are "two Chinese gentlemen of the highest rank [who] were selected from the foreign office to conduct the Chinese correspondence, and as 'learners'". *Ibid.*, p. 494.

[24] The full Chinese and English texts of this treaty are to be found in *Treaties, Conventions, etc., between China and Foreign States* (2d ed., Shanghai, 1917), I, 404-420.

[25] Determining the difference between "beneficial and non-injurious matters" and "very important matters" would seem to be no simple task. It may be, of course, that this rather indefinite distinction was made intentionally in order to give the envoys more freedom of action than would appear from a casual perusal of their instructions.

factory results have been obtained, the matter of sending permanent missions will be brought up for discussion. The instructions insist, finally, that, under the terms of the Anglo-Chinese Treaty of Tientsin, the students, secretaries, and orderlies accompanying the mission, shall receive proper protection in each of the countries visited.[26]

When the question of providing the envoys with letters of credence was raised, two difficulties presented themselves. In the first place, many of the high officials in the government felt that the sending of a letter from the emperor directly to the heads of government of the Western powers would be a violation of the traditional supremacy of the Son of Heaven.[27] They had been quite willing to have the emperor approve the sending of the mission, which they seem to have looked upon as another foreign office experiment not unlike the Pin Ch'un venture of the preceding year, but giving it personal letters of recommendation from the emperor was another matter.

Fortunately Hart and Brown were able to meet this difficulty by pointing out through the foreign office that the emperor had on two previous occasions written letters in answer to communications from the President of the United States, and "that if his Majesty could personally reply to a letter from the President of the United States without derogating from his authority and dignity, he certainly could write a letter to him with equal propriety".[28] The foreign office, in its memorial of December 24 formally requesting letters of credence, quotes Brown to the effect that it is customary in other countries to give diplomatic representatives credentials in order to give assurance of their reliability, and cites as a precedent from China's own history the fact that credentials were carried by Chinese envoys in ancient times.[29]

The other difficulty arose out of the Western custom of having diplomatic representatives personally present their letters of credence to the rulers to whom they were addressed. The audience question had been a vexing one from the time of the arrival of the first foreign ministers in Peking, for the foreign representatives had demanded the right to present their credentials to the emperor in person, as was the custom in Western countries, whereas the Chinese were willing to accede to this

[26] *IWSM*, LII, 2b–5a.

[27] It should be pointed out, however, that the foreign office, in its memorial of Nov. 26 recommending the appointment of Chih Kang and Sun Chia-ku to accompany Burlingame, informs the emperor that this mission is of a very different nature from the one sent to the Loochoo kingdom, which is looked upon as a tributary by the Chinese. *Ibid.*, 1b, 10–2a, 1.

[28] S. W. Williams to Seward, *For. Rel.*, *1868*, I, 503.

[29] *IWSM*, LIV, 29b, 9.

demand only on the understanding that the foreigners would perform the kowtow. The foreign ministers refused to perform this ceremony on the ground that it reflected upon the dignity of their countries and themselves, and a compromise had been worked out by eliminating the imperial audience during the minority of the emperor. Now, however, the Chinese apparently feared that in presenting letters of credence to the heads of the various governments to which they were sent, Burlingame and his associates would establish a precedent as to the ceremony followed which might prove to be embarrassing should the foreign ministers demand that it be followed in Peking.

The foreign office solved this second difficulty by another compromise. In its memorial of December 20, mentioned above, it says that in order to avoid the suspicion of the powers it is necessary to provide the mission with letters of credence, but that it does not seem necessary to have these letters presented personally to the various heads of government. It points out that on certain occasions in the past the British and Belgian ministers have forwarded their credentials through high provincial officials or through the foreign office, although since the establishment of legations in Peking most of the foreign ministers have not presented credentials or have merely sent copies of their letters of credence to the foreign office. It is considered possible, therefore, for the envoys to follow the British and Belgian precedent and have the chief minister of each government present their letter of credence to the ruler for them. Burlingame is to be instructed to follow this procedure and also to notify each government that the same procedure is to be followed thereafter by its representative in Peking.[30]

In a communication to Burlingame at the same time, the foreign office informs him that on two occasions American ministers have forwarded their credentials to the emperor through high Chinese officials and because of the difference between Chinese and foreign ceremonials he is instructed to follow that precedent in presenting his letters of credence in America and in other countries. He is further told that should he find it impossible to refuse to follow Western etiquette in this matter, he must explain at the time that he is following Western ceremony and that it is different from Chinese ceremony.[31] In another

[30] *Ibid.*, 30a, 4–30b, 8.

[31] *Ibid.*, 31a–32a. That the foreign office wrote this letter for Burlingame's information, and not merely to mislead the Chinese court, is substantiated by the following translation of a letter which Cordier says was sent by the foreign office to the French chargé d'affaires in Peking on Sept. 19, 1869, in reply to a request from the foreign ministers for an imperial audience: "Avant le départ de M. Burlingame, nous demandâmes respectueusement (à l'Empereur) des instructions que nous reçumes (ainsi conçues):

communication Burlingame is instructed to avoid all things forbidden in China, and to follow Chinese customs and regulations. If, however, because he is a Westerner, the powers deal with him according to Western customs, he must make known the Chinese custom, in order that the powers shall have no chance in the future to claim that China does not reciprocate their courtesies.[32]

The letters of credence, all of which are the same except for the name of the country whose ruler was being addressed, begin with a few formal words of greeting which are followed by an expressed desire that the friendly relations existing between China and the named state may be perpetuated. The appointment of Anson Burlingame, Chih Kang, and Sun Chia-ku as Chinese envoys is announced and full confidence is expressed in their character and ability. The letters close with the statement that the emperor would be deeply gratified by the establishment of permanent peace and harmony among all nations.[33] The letters of credence, eleven in number, were written in Chinese and Manchu on imperial yellow paper, and were dispatched in the care of Brown, who joined the other members of the mission in Shanghai.[34]

Although there is no evidence in the available Chinese documents to show that there was organized opposition to the sending of this mission, we know from Williams's letter of January 25 that there was strong opposition to the granting of credentials and that had it not been for the ingenious arguments of Brown and Hart there probably would have been no letters of credence. It seems safe to say, however, after an examination of the answers to a "secret letter" which had been sent by the foreign office to the higher provincial officials of the empire on October 12 requesting an expression of opinion on certain questions, among

'Lors de l'arrivée de M. Burlingame dans un pays, les lettres de créance dont il est porteur devront être confiées à l'intermédiaire des Ministres compétents sans qu'il soit besoin de se mettre en instance pour les remettre en mains propres.

'Si un pays (un souverain) considérant M. Burlingame comme occidental désire le traiter conformément aux coutumes d'Occident avec de plus grands égards, M. Burlingame devra déclarer préalablement, afin qu'il ne soit pas supposé dans la suite que la Chine ne sait pas reconnaître de tels procédés, que le cérémonial chinois n'est pas le même que celui d'Occident.' " Henri Cordier, *Histoire des relations de la Chine avec les puissances occidentales, 1860–1900* (Paris, 1901), I, 301. While the writer has not found such a letter in the Chinese documents under the date given by Cordier, he has found one very like this French translation, written by the Chinese foreign office in answer to a joint request for an audience, dated Mar. 21, 1873. *IWSM*, LXXXIX, 37b, 6–38a, 6.

[32] *Ibid.*, LIV, 32a–32b.

[33] Von Gumpach, pp. 62–64. The official English translation is also to be found in that book, pp. 66–67, and in *For. Rel., 1868*, I, 601–602. The letters were dated Dec 31, 1867.

[34] S. W. Williams to Seward, *ibid.*, p. 502.

them that of sending envoys abroad,[35] that few of the higher provincial officials would have opposed this mission; in fact, several who knew of the plan to send it before they wrote their answers definitely expressed their approval.[36] And we know of none of the higher metropolitan officials who definitely opposed it.[37]

Burlingame left Peking on November 25, 1867,[38] proceeding to Shanghai by steamer from Tientsin. While awaiting the arrival of the other members of the mission, he is reported to have paid a visit to Tsêng Kuo-fan,[v] governor general of the two Kiang provinces and one of the senior statesmen of the empire, in Nanking. Tsêng seems to have been no more than civil to Burlingame,[39] to the disappointment of certain foreigners who felt that a declaration from this man in support of the mission would greatly have added to its prestige.

On January 4, 1868, Chih Kang and Sun Chia-ku were received at an imperial audience. In answer to a question concerning their contemplated itinerary, they informed the empresses dowager and the emperor that they were leaving the capital the next day and after an overland trip to Shanghai they would sail to the United States via Japan.

[35] *Ibid.*, pp. 502–503; *IWSM*, L, 32a, 32b.

[36] Ting Pao-chên,[r] *ibid.*, LII, 26b; Li Hung-chang,[s] *ibid.*, LV, 12a; and Kuan Wen,[t] who, although he opposed permanent missions, had no objection to this one, *ibid.*, LVI, 11b.

[37] There is evidence to indicate that the memorial which is adduced as proof of opposition by Professor Williams in his study of this mission is a forgery. From an unsigned article entitled "Chinese Statesmen and State Papers" (which he attributes to Sir Rutherford Alcock), in *Fraser's Magazine*, N. S., III (1871), 340 ff., but which he incorrectly cites as from the *Fortnightly Review*, I, Professor Williams summarizes a memorial allegedly written by Wo Jên,[u] a high metropolitan official and tutor to the young emperor. This memorial, which is very critical of the mission, does not appear in any of the Chinese documents examined and an examination of the evidence indicates that it is not genuine. In the first place, it is extremely unlikely that the emperor would issue more than one edict in making any one appointment and since in the official documents are to be found a decree, dated Nov. 21, appointing Burlingame, and another decree, dated Nov. 26, appointing the other two envoys, the genuineness of such a decree as is quoted in the memorial, making all the appointments and dated the 26th day of the 10th moon (Nov. 21, 1867), is to be questioned. In the second place, there would be no point to the argument concerning the subordinate positions of the Chinese envoys in the memorial, because Chih Kang and Sun Chia-ku were not made "sub-envoys". As we have already seen, they held the same office as Burlingame. Professor Williams (p. 106) fails to produce any valid "evidences of dissatisfaction over the conception of an Embassy to the Western powers" which he says were "numerous and immediate on the part of the conservative politicians in Peking". For a summary of the alleged Wo Jên memorial, see *ibid.*, pp. 108–109.

[38] S. W. Williams to Seward, *For. Rel., 1868*, I. 495.

[39] Williams, p. 89. Unfortunately Professor Williams does not cite his source for this information.

From there they would cross the Atlantic to England, and then travel to France, Belgium, Holland, Denmark, Sweden, Russia, Prussia, Spain, and Italy, returning to China via the Mediterranean and South Seas. When asked a question concerning audiences with foreign rulers, they replied that that matter depended upon the rulers—that they themselves would not request such interviews.[40] In reply to an admonition, they promised to see that their attendants behaved themselves, thus avoiding disgrace to themselves and to their country. They left Peking, as they had said, on the 5th and arrived in Shanghai on February 3.[41]

The mission sailed from Shanghai on February 25 and after a short unofficial stop in Yokohama, sailed from Japan on March 8. San Francisco was reached on April 1 and the members of the mission spent nearly a month in that city, occupying their time with social activities, visits to shipyards, machine shops, factories, etc., and with interviews with the representatives of the Chinese merchants and laborers living in California. The party sailed from San Francisco for Panama on April 30 and after proceeding across the Isthmus by rail, took ship again and reached New York on May 23.[42]

After a ten-day stay in New York, the mission proceeded to Washington, where the envoys promptly called at the Department of State and in a formal note to Secretary Seward, in which Burlingame attributed to himself rank and position to which he had no right, requested that a day be set for the presentation of their letters of credence; June 6 was decided upon as a suitable date for this ceremony. It is difficult to reconcile this request with Burlingame's instructions and with the statement made by the Chinese envoys during their audience the day before they left Peking, but it is even more difficult to see any basis for the claims made by Burlingame. Not only did he not hold "the first Chinese rank", as he announced in this note and repeated in his speech to the President on the 6th, but he had never been given any Chinese rank; and the superiority over his two co-envoys which is implied in both is quite unjustifiable since, as we have already seen, they held exactly the same position as he. In granting the request for an interview with the President, Secretary Seward reserved the right of an

[40] This point should be kept in mind when the correspondence between the mission and the American Department of State is examined a little later, for in Washington a formal request was made for an interview with the President of the United States.

[41] I Hou, *Ch'u-shih T'ai-hsi chi [Diary of the First Envoys to the West]*, in Wang Hsi-ch'i, *Hsiao fang-hu-chai yü-ti ts'ung-ch'ao*[w] (1891), XIth Book, 102a, 6–15. This work is hereafter referred to as *Chih Kang's Diary*. *IWSM*, LVI, 21a, 3; LVII, 35a, 8–9.

[42] *Ibid.*, LXIX, 16a, 4–9. *Chih Kang's Diary*, 103b, 17–104b, 18; 105a–107b; 107b, 3; 108a, 8.

audience with the emperor for the American representative in Peking, and although this right was to be waived during the minority of the emperor, it would seem that accepting this condition without protest constituted another violation of Burlingame's instructions. At any rate the three envoys were received by President Johnson on the appointed day with the same ceremony as when any other newly arrived diplomatic representative was received.[43]

After the members of the mission had spent nearly a month attending dinners and receptions and visiting Congress and places of interest, Burlingame opened conversations with the Department of State in the course of which various matters relating to Chinese foreign relations were discussed. As a result of these discussions eight supplementary articles to the Sino-American Treaty of Tientsin were signed on July 28[44] by Secretary of State Seward and the three representatives of the emperor of China. These negotiations would seem to have violated Burlingame's instructions, since he had been told not to initiate any but routine negotiations without specific permission from the Chinese foreign office, although as we have already pointed out, the wording of his instructions was rather indefinite in this connection and may have been left so intentionally in order to allow the envoys considerable freedom.[45] But there seems to be no justification for the unauthorized seniority which Burlingame claimed over his co-envoys and which is perpetuated in the preamble of the English text of this so-called Treaty of Washington.[46]

On July 31, 1868, the mission left Washington for New York, and on September 9, after visiting Boston, Albany, and other cities, sailed for

[43] *Ibid.*, 108b, 3, 11–17. *IWSM*, LXIX, 16b, 6–9; 16b, 9–17a, 3. *For. Rel., 1868*, I, 601, 603–604.

[44] *IWSM*, LXIX, 17b, 2–5.

[45] However, it must be pointed out that the envoys had no "full powers" in the European sense of the term; in spite of the statement in the preamble of the English text of the treaty that the negotiators had "exchanged their full powers, found to be in due and proper form", they had no instructions to negotiate or sign treaties. William Frederick Mayers, *Treaties between the Empire of China and Foreign Powers* (5th ed., Shanghai, 1906), p. 93.

[46] ". . . and His Majesty the Emperor of China, Anson Burlingame, accredited as his Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary, and Chih Kang, and Sun Chia-ku, of the second Chinese rank, associated high Envoys and Ministers of his said Majesty . . .", *ibid.* This same discrimination between the envoys is found in the Chinese text reproduced in *Treaties, Conventions, etc.*, I, 729, 11–13, in which Burlingame's name is given the center position, as is proper since he really led the mission, but in which he alone is given the title "Imperially Appointed", which belonged to all of them, and the additional title of "Minister Holding a Serious Trust"[x] to which he had no special right. The Chinese text which appears in *IWSM*, LXIX, 18b–21b and in *Chih Kang's Diary*, 109b, 3–110a, 14, has no preamble.

Europe, arriving in London on September 19.[47] The time spent in England was largely devoted to being entertained and to seeing places of interest, but Burlingame also succeeded in securing the declaration of a new British policy toward China from Lord Clarendon, minister for foreign affairs in the new Liberal Gladstone government.[48] The British government virtually abandoned its policy of resorting to force in securing commercial advantages in China and also repudiated its custom of bringing pressure to bear locally to secure the fulfillment of treaty obligations. It promised to replace these with a policy of patience with regard to the development of China's international relations and to appeal only to the central government for redress for wrongs done British subjects or interests. The negotiations which led to this declaration were completely in accord with Burlingame's instructions and represented exactly what the foreign office seems to have had in mind when it dispatched the mission. The envoys had presented their letters of credence to the queen at Windsor on November 20, and they sailed from Dover on January 2, 1869.[49]

On the Continent the mission did not secure as important results as it had been able to obtain in the United States and England, for the French government refused to commit itself in any way, Burlingame died before anything could be accomplished in Russia, and relations with the other countries visited were of little importance to China. The envoys were received in person by the rulers of all the powers to whom they bore letters of credence, and were feted and shown the principal points of interest in all the countries visited. The mission went directly to Paris from England, and remained there for more than eight months in an effort to secure a statement from the French government, but it did not succeed in accomplishing anything. Leaving Paris on September 21, 1869, the party went to Sweden via Belgium, Prussia, and Denmark, reaching Stockholm on the 27th. Returning to Copenhagen on October 11, the envoys spent two weeks there, and at the end of that time left for Holland, reaching The Hague on October 30. The mission departed for Berlin on November 20, and remained in that city six weeks. In the conversations which took place between Burlingame and Bismarck, the former declared, truthfully, that it was not the desire of the Chinese government to make new treaties, but to obtain from the powers prom-

[47] *Ibid.*, 110b, 18–115b, 15.

[48] This policy is defined in two documents: one, a letter to Burlingame, dated Dec. 28, 1868, and the other a dispatch to Alcock, British minister to China, dated Jan. 13, 1869. These documents are to be found in *Parl. Papers* [Command], 1868–1869, vol. LXIV, *Accounts and Papers*, China, no. 1, pp. 1–2, 5.

[49] *Chih Kang's Diary*, 118a, 5–119a, 17.

ises of forbearance in demanding the execution of the old ones. In reply Bismarck issued a statement to the effect that the North German Confederation was ready to deal with the central government of China in whatever manner the latter considered to be to the best interest of China,[50] a declaration which must have given much satisfaction to those officials who were responsible for having sent the mission. On January 31, 1870, the party left Prussia for Russia, where Burlingame contracted pneumonia and died on February 23.[51]

We have no information concerning the date when the foreign office first learned of the negotiation and signing of the eight supplementary articles to the Treaty of Tientsin, for the letter from the Chinese envoys which contains the description of their activities in Washington is reproduced in the *Ch'ou-pan i-wu shih-mo* without a date.[52] However, we do find in the archives of the American legation in Peking the translation of a letter on the subject, dated March 12, 1869, from Prince Kung to J. Ross Browne, who succeeded Burlingame as American minister and who had been appointed to exchange the ratifications of the Washington Treaty with the Chinese government. This letter acknowledges the receipt of a letter from Browne requesting the appointment of an official to exchange the ratifications and states in reply that the Chinese government considers it advisable to await the return of the mission in order that the new articles may be discussed with its members before ratification and exchange are effected.[53]

Meanwhile the mission's success in securing from the American and British governments expressions of sympathy with Chinese self-development and independence of action, and Burlingame's bursts of oratory in the United States, directed against the predatory tactics of the foreign merchants doing business in China and painting an extremely favorable picture of Chinese "progress", had stirred up an almost hysterical outburst against the mission in the English language press in the open ports of China. The delay of the Chinese government in ratifying the Washington articles was seized upon as proof of its refusal to ratify and of its failure to support the mission,[54] although the explanation offered

[50] *Ibid.*, 119b, 2–128b, 10; Williams, pp. 243, 247.

[51] *Chih Kang's Diary*, 130b, 7–131a, 17. *IWSM*, LXXII, 9a, 2–3.

[52] *Ibid.*, LXIX, 15b–17b.

[53] This document is to be found in U. S. Legation Arch., China, no. 233, ff., 963-965. It is reproduced in Williams, pp. 200–201. Although the original Chinese version has not been found, there seems to be no reason to question its genuineness.

[54] See S. W. Williams to Fish, Nov. 24, 1869, Department of State, China, vol. XXVII, no. 69. This letter is quoted in Williams, pp. 228–229, although it is erroneously cited as from "vol. 28".

by the foreign office seems quite reasonable to anyone cognizant of the unfortunate experiences China had had with foreign treaties and foreign military force during the preceding thirty years.

On October 1, 1869, Williams, again American chargé d'affaires after the resignation and departure of Browne, wrote to Secretary of State Fish concerning a recent interview that he had had with the ministers of the foreign office. In the course of the conversation, Wen Hsiang[y] said:

> . . . the government had deemed it best to defer exchanging the ratifications of this treaty until the return of their envoys from Europe, and that this was the purport of the reply made to Mr. Browne last spring when he informed them of his appointment as special commissioner for the purpose. It was yet uncertain what arrangements Mr. Burlingame might make in Europe with the courts which he was to visit, and until they knew this, they deemed it the safest way to defer the completion of this treaty. There was no intention on their part of any disrespect or slight to the United States in so doing, and no intention to decline the stipulations of a treaty which were favourable to them.

The conversation then turned to the criticisms which foreigners had made of the mission and to foreign reports that the emperor had refused to ratify the treaty. These the Chinese ministers considered very unfair, particularly since, "so far as they knew, Mr. Burlingame had done nothing contrary to the purposes of his mission".[55] It is interesting to note that neither at this time nor at any later time did the foreign office indicate that it felt that the mission had exceeded its instructions, even though it is quite obvious that such was the case.

The Washington articles were ratified by the emperor and the ratifications exchanged before the envoys had had time to return and make explanations, however, because Burlingame and his colleagues found their activities in Europe seriously handicapped by the fact that the Chinese government had not yet formally accepted the agreement they had signed in the United States. The outbreak of anti-foreign demonstrations in China shortly after the dispatch of the mission had also tended to undermine confidence in the sincerity of the Chinese government, so Brown, first secretary of the mission, was sent back to Peking personally to urge the foreign office to secure the ratification of the American treaty. In a memorial presented to the Throne on November 18, 1869, and enclosing two letters from Chih Kang and Sun Chia-ku and a copy of the Chinese text of the treaty, the foreign office explains that it had intended to await the return of the mission in order to discuss the

[55] This communication is to be found in Dept. St., China, vol. XXVII, no. 65. It is reproduced in Williams, pp. 224–227.

terms of the new treaty with the envoys before presenting to the Throne those articles which were satisfactory and requesting imperial ratification. But now the envoys have written asking that prompt action be taken, and have even sent Brown to urge it, so, in view of the fact that China's foreign relations have really benefited from the activities of the mission, the emperor is requested to grant the envoys' petition in order that their activities may be facilitated.[56]

In answer to this memorial an edict was handed down appointing Tung Hsün,[s] one of the ministers of the foreign office, to act as the emperor's representative with full power to exchange the ratifications of the eight supplementary articles to the Treaty of Tientsin with the American representative.[57] On November 21, S. W. Williams, the American chargé d'affaires, received a communication from Tung Hsün in which it was stated that Brown, who has been sent back to Peking by the envoys for that purpose, has satisfactorily "explained all the circumstances connected with the negotiation of these eight additional articles", and as a consequence the foreign office has given up its former intention to await the return of the mission before asking for ratification. Since all the provisions in the articles "are advantageous to both nations, His Majesty's rescript has already been issued, directing that the affair be speedily arranged in order to show his appreciation of the great friendliness and cordial desire shown by the United States to strengthen our peaceable relations . . .".[58]

November 22 was set as the day on which the exchange was to be effected, but when Williams and Tung Hsün met at the foreign office it was discovered that the copy of the treaty which had been signed by the President of the United States contained only the English text. The exchange was consequently postponed until the next day to allow time for writing in the Chinese text. When the ceremony was over, the foreign office had copies of the treaty made and sent to the important offices in Peking and to the high officials in the coastal provinces.[59] There seems to be no valid reason for questioning the good faith of the Chinese government because of the delay in ratifying this treaty. The Chinese were still inexperienced in the methods of Western diplomacy and probably saw no reason why the matter should be hurried. Their desire for fuller information from the members of their mission was but natural, even though the articles seemed to contain nothing

[56] *IWSM*, LXIX, 14a–21b; 14b, 4–15b, 3.

[57] *Ibid.*, 15b, 4–6.

[58] *Ibid.*, 39b, 5–40a, 7. A translation of this document is to be found in Dept. St., China, vol. XXVII, enclosure to no. 69.

[59] *IWSM*, LXIX, 38b, 9; 39a, 2–39b, 4.

disadvantageous to China. Brown supplied that information and also offered valid reasons for prompt ratification, and the foreign office acted at once.

We have already traced the progress of the mission through Europe to Russia, where Burlingame died after a brief illness, and we must now examine the reaction of the Chinese government to his demise, particularly since Cordier says that its attitude was one of indifference. In a memorial to the Throne, dated May 10, 1870, the ministers of the foreign office report that they received their first information of Burlingame's death in March from the Russian representative in Peking, who had been notified by telegraph and courier.[60] They wrote at once, even before hearing directly from Chih Kang and Sun Chia-ku, ordering them to send more information, and to speed up the work of the mission, always acting in consultation with Brown and De Champs.[61] They go on to say that a letter has finally been received from Chih Kang and Sun giving the details of Burlingame's illness and death and saying that they have turned over to Mrs. Burlingame 6000 taels from the funds of the mission to pay for sending the body back to the United States and to take care of funeral expenses. Because Burlingame died in the service of China, the emperor is requested by the foreign office to bestow, posthumously, the brevet first official rank upon him and to grant to his family an additional sum of 10,000 taels from the funds of the mission to show that China makes proper provision for her envoys.[62]

In answer to the above memorial an edict was issued giving effect to the recommendations of the foreign office and upholding the instructions sent to Chih Kang and Sun by ordering them jointly, with the assistance of Brown and De Champs, to carry on the matters initiated before Burlingame's death.[63] On May 14, Frederick F. Low, the new American minister, was notified by the foreign office of the steps which had been taken regarding the matter of Burlingame's death in a letter which included a copy of the whole edict with the exception of a few unimportant lines.[64] Cordier's criticism of the attitude of the Chinese government in this matter seems undeservedly harsh, for as Low writes to Secretary Fish on May 19, the "duties entrusted to Mr. Burlingame

[60] Cordier, I, 302; Williams, p. 263.

[61] The implication in Cordier (I, 302) that Great Britain tried to have Brown promoted to the position left vacant by Burlingame's death receives no support from the Chinese documents.

[62] *IWSM*, LXXII, 9a, 2–10a, 9. Cordier says: "La Chine payait en argent, non en regrets", I, 302.

[63] *IWSM*, LXXII, 10a, 10–10b, 8. *Chih Kang's Diary*, 138a, 14–18.

[64] U. S. Legation Arch., China, no. 234, ff. 189–190.

had been performed to the entire satisfaction of the Emperor and his advisers, and . . . his services . . . acknowledged in a manner evincing great respect, gratitude and liberality".[65] It is difficult to see what more could have been done.

The mission left Russia on April 20, 1870, and after a brief stop in Berlin reached the capital of Belgium on the 26th. On May 15 it went on to Paris, whence it departed for Italy on the 28th, reaching Florence, after some stops by the way, nine days later. The party devoted some two weeks to sight-seeing in Italy and then returned to Paris, arriving there nearly a month before the news of the Tientsin Massacre. The mission remained there during the period of the most bitter feeling against the Chinese after the arrival of the news, and Chih Kang was able to record some of the manifestations of this bitterness in his diary.[66]

On August 1 the members of the mission left Paris for Spain, and returned on the 13th after having spent most of the time in Madrid. Leaving Paris for the last time on the 27th, the envoys went to Marseilles where they embarked for China, reaching Shanghai on October 18. A month later, on November 18, they arrived in Peking, after having been away nearly three years and having traveled about 42,000 miles.[67]

The sending of the Burlingame Mission marked a distinct departure from the traditional attitude of the Chinese government toward other countries, for it represented the first voluntary effort to deal with Western powers on terms of equality. According to the judgment of H. B. Morse and many other foreigners, the mission was a failure because it was not followed at once by the establishment of Chinese legations abroad, but the available evidence gives more support to Professor Williams's belief that "its success was quite equal to the anticipations of its promotors". The Chinese officials who had charge of foreign relations evidently felt that, having accomplished their immediate purpose by sending this mission, further representation abroad could be postponed until a more definite need should arise.

KNIGHT BIGGERSTAFF.

Peiping, China.

[65] *Ibid.*, 185. A portion of this letter is quoted in Williams, pp. 263–264.

[66] *Chih Kang's Diary*, 133a, 3–137a, 4; 137a, 5–139a, 14. News of the massacre, which took place on June 21, 1870, and in the course of which thirteen French subjects, including two consular officials, seven other foreigners, and a number of Chinese Christians were killed by the Tientsin populace, was received in Paris from Kiakhta on July 20. *Ibid.*, 138b, 16.

[67] *Ibid.*, 139b, 3–144a, 16.

Chinese Characters.

a. 籌辦夷務始末
b. 同文館
c. 斌椿
d. 恭親王
e. 辦理各國中外交涉
事務大臣
f. 章京
g. 大臣之左協理
大臣之右協理
h. 志剛
i. 孫家穀
j. 辦理中外交涉
事務大臣
k. 德明 張德彝
l. 鳳儀
m. 塔克什訥
n. 桂榮
o. 聯芳
p. 廷俊
q. 有益無損
重大
r. 丁寶楨
s. 李鴻章
t. 官文
u. 倭仁
v. 曾國藩
w. 宜垕初使泰西記
王錫祺 小方壺齋
輿地叢鈔
x. 欽差
重任大臣
y. 文祥
z. 董恂

NOTES AND SUGGESTIONS

The "Chronicle" Misunderstood

The Peterborough text of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* is a chief authority for the dire condition of England during the reign of King Stephen; perhaps therefore it is high time to point out that a passage in it has been misunderstood, even in books so recent as certain by H. W. C. Davis, E. P. Cheyney, and A. L. Cross.[1] Under the year 1137 this chronicle has it that when his traitorous lords found Stephen a mild man and soft and kindly, and executing no justice, "tha diden hi alle wunder". This means that they committed every outrage and enormity (as no modern narrator seems to recognize), and is the soundest of Anglo-Saxon; *wunder*, a neuter noun, should have no ending in the accusative plural, and the meaning is a common one, and reappears only a dozen or two lines below (misunderstood again by Thorpe). Yet the modern writers mentioned render the passage "then did they all wonder", or the like. One need not point out the false note thus read into so external and matter-of-fact a chronicle, or the greater fitness of the right meaning to what follows. The above would be, in the language of the time, "tha wundreden hi alle"; hardly even "tha diden hi alle wundren", for the purely periphrastic use of *don* seems never clearly found in Anglo-Saxon.[2]

J. S. P. Tatlock.

The University of California.

Status of the Ex-Confederate States As Seen in the Readmission of United States Senators

The existing literature on that period of American history dealing with the Civil War and its aftermath fails to take into account one

[1] *Englond under the Normans and Angevins* (London, 1921), p. 158; *Readings in English History* (Boston, 1922), p. 129; *History of England and Greater Britain* (New York, 1914), p. 101; also in K. Coman and E. K. Kendall, *History of England* (New York, 1900), p. 77. Some of these show other mistranslations in this part of the *Chronicle*. Some may have been misled by the bad translation of a bad text in the edition by Benjamin Thorpe, or by the translation by J. Ingram (1823, and in the reprints of 1912, 1917), or that by J. A. Giles, or the edition by J. Earle—all "scholars of the old school". *Corrumpunt mores bonos colloquia mala.* All this shows the great need of a reliable translation. The edition of C. Plummer is correct here.

[2] The only Anglo-Saxon cases quoted by anyone, from the Alfredian Orosius and Boethius, may and probably do have the causative sense usual with *don* with the infinitive.

phase of the Reconstruction process which has a definite bearing upon the question of the actual status of the Southern states as seen in the completion of the radical program on the part of Congress. Reference is made to the fact that in the readmission of United States senators from the reconstructed states the former classification of the membership in the Senate was rigidly maintained. The meaning and significance of this observance will be clarified by a brief consideration of the system of classes which prevails in that body.

It is to be remembered that in accordance with the Constitution the Senate originally divided itself by lot, as nearly as possible into three equal groups. Designated as class one, class two, and class three, respectively, they consisted of members whose terms were due to expire in 1791, 1793, and 1795, in the order named.[1] For the purpose of this study it is important to note in general the nature of the classes of senators thus created in 1789. In the first place their continuity has been preserved, with the dates of the expiration of the periods of service simply progressing in units of six years, corresponding to the senatorial term of office. Secondly, with the admission of new states into the Union care has been taken to keep the classes as nearly equal in numbers as possible. Finally, once the representatives of a state have been classified that state has been regarded as fixed in that respect. The practices by which these developments have obtained now require further explanation.

As has been inferred, the original thirteen states did not elect their first members of the Senate for terms of any designated length. The same was true of the thirty-five states later admitted into the Union. A survey of the various state legislative journals shows that their initial members of the upper branch of Congress were chosen, one may say, simply as United States senators.[2] So their credentials read. The Senate invariably had the two senators-elect in each case draw for position,

[1] See *Senate Journal*, 1 Cong., 1 sess., pp. 25-26. The first senators from New York, North Carolina, and Rhode Island later drew separately for their positions. *Ibid.*, pp. 48, 109, 166. All *Senate Journal* entries regarding classification of senators from 1789 through 1907 have been collected in "Proceedings of the Senate relating to the Classification of United States Senators", *Senate Document*, 62 Cong., 2 sess., no. 334.

[2] For example, on Dec. 20, 1849, John C. Fremont and W. M. Gwin were each duly declared "elected United States Senator" from California. California, *Senate Journal*, 1 sess., pp. 23-24. On Jan. 8, 1896, the governor of the new state of Utah reminded the legislature of his state that among its duties was that of selecting "two of your fellow citizens to represent the State of Utah in the Senate of the United States". Subsequently, F. J. Cannon and A. Brown were elected as "Senators in the Congress of the United States". Utah, *Sen. Journal*, 1 sess., pp. 29, 118.

always keeping in mind the comparative size of the classes.[3] Thus the new members had no choice but to accept the remaining portions of two, four, or six year terms, as the cases proved to be. An attempt was made to influence the Senate to waive this rule in 1889, when the legislature of the State of North Dakota adopted resolutions requesting that one of its senators-elect, G. A. Pierce, be assigned to the four-year term ending in 1893. The Senate, however, took no action on these resolutions; and, as it so happened, Pierce drew the two-year term expiring in 1891.[4]

Throughout the history of our present government it frequently has happened that for some reason or another, such as a death, resignation, failure of the legislature to act, contested elections, *et cetera,* one or more states for relatively short periods of time have not been fully represented in the Senate. When such vacancies have been filled, however, whether in the same or subsequent terms, the incumbents in every case automatically have assumed positions in the classes occupied by their predecessors.[5] As will now be seen, this was not different at all from the way senators from the Southern states were received in the Senate after the War.

At the time of the election of Abraham Lincoln to the presidency, with thirty-three states in the Union, the three classes of United States senators consisted of twenty-two members each. The dates for the expiration of the terms in class three were 1861, 1867, and 1873, *et cetera;* those for class one were 1863, 1869, and 1875; while those for class two were 1865, 1871, and 1877. In connection with the War the ranks of these classes actually, if not theoretically, were depleted as follows: Class three lost seven members, class one five, and class two ten. Meanwhile at different periods, after some but before other Southern senators had withdrawn, the states of Kansas, West Virginia, and Nevada were admitted into the Union. Nebraska soon followed. In having the senators from these new states draw for assignment the Senate regarded the size of the classes not as they were in view of the senators actually in attendance, but as they would have been if none of the members had

[3] *Sen. Doc.*, 62 Cong., 2 sess., no. 334. Arizona and New Mexico only are not included therein.

[4] *Ibid.*, pp. 19, 20.

[5] The changes in the personnel of the Senate are recorded, of course, in the directories for the successive sessions of Congress. A convenient collection of such data is contained in *The Biographical Directory of the American Congress, 1774-1927* (Washington, 1928), issued as *House Doc.*, 69 Cong., 2 sess., no. 783. Useful, too, are the tables relative to the senators of the United States, included in the *Senate Manual*, the latest edition of which appeared as *Sen. Doc.*, 73 Cong., 2 sess., no. 192.

departed. Significant enough, although such action was taken in the cases of all four of these states, before the last of them had been admitted some of the Southern states, as is well known, had failed to regain representation in the Senate. Thus the withdrawal of the Southern senators, technically at least, did not affect the existence of their seats in the Senate nor the composition of the classes.[6]

This *status quo* continued unchanged; for when the Southern states finally were readmitted to representation the senators from each one took their places, without a drawing or special assignment, in the classes in which their state previously had been represented. To those classes specifically, in fact, they had been elected by their state legislatures. Joshua Hill, for example, on July 29, 1868, was chosen United States senator from Georgia for the "unexpired term of six years, commencing the 4th day of March, 1867"; and H. V. M. Miller was elected for the "unexpired term of six years, commencing the 4th day of March, 1865".[7] The Senate accepted as a matter of fact such specifications in the credentials of all the senators coming from the states in question.[8] In so doing it unquestionably regarded them as being old, and not new, states in the Union.

One searches in vain for an official enactment of any kind on the matter of classifying, after the War, the senators from those states which attempted permanently to sever their connection with the United States. It was not covered in the Reconstruction Act of March 2, 1867, in the supplementary Reconstruction measures, or any of the laws readmitting individual Southern states, or groups of them, to representation in Congress. It does not appear to have been the subject of any regulation or ruling by the Senate. Nor did that body ever debate or discuss

[6] The procedure relating to the admission of the eight new senators is covered in *Sen. Doc.*, 62 Cong., 2 sess., no. 334, pp. 15, 16, 17. The two from Nevada, by way of example, were assigned to classes three and one, at a time when in reality there were sixteen and nineteen members, respectively, in these groups, but only fifteen in class two. Theoretically, however, the addition of Nevada's senators brought the levels of classes three and one up to that of number two, with twenty-four members in each.

[7] Georgia, *Sen. Journal*, called session of the general assembly, commenced July 4, 1868, p. 96. Corresponding records in the various other state legislative journals and the United States *Senate Journal* show that all senators from the reconstructed states were chosen to fill such unexpired terms.

[8] Needless to state, inasmuch as these states did not come back into representation in the same order in which they went out, the Senate failed to preserve a balance between the classes of senators as actually composed. See *The Biographical Directory of the American Congress* and the *Senate Manual*, as previously cited. It would serve no useful purpose here, of course, to give separate individual references for the readmission of the twenty-two senators.

the question specifically as such. The general consensus of opinion of the Senate may be inferred definitely, however, from certain remarks which fell in numerous discussions on subjects somewhat closely connected with the one under review. These may be analyzed briefly.

On January 22, 1861, Senator Judah P. Benjamin of Louisiana offered a resolution providing that the *Senate Journal* record the fact that on the preceding day Senators C. C. Clay, jr. and Benjamin Fitzpatrick of Alabama, Stephen R. Mallory and David Y. Yulee of Florida, and Jefferson Davis of Mississippi made announcement that their states "had seceded from the Union", and that thus they considered themselves "no longer entitled to retain their seats as senators". Among the numerous opponents of this resolution was Senator William H. Seward of New York, who moved that Benjamin's resolution be tabled. In explaining his opposition to such a *Journal* entry, Seward said:

> . . . I am for leaving these seats here for those Senators, or for other Senators from the States which they represent, to be resumed at their own time and in their good pleasure. I hope that the time will not be long before they will be here again . . .

Seward was upheld by a decidedly sectional vote of yeas, 32, nays 22.[9]

On March 14, 1861, the Senate adopted a resolution declaring vacant the seats of certain senators whose terms were unexpired, but who recently had withdrawn from that body in consequence of the adoption of secession ordinances by their states. The original sponsor of the resolution, Senator W. P. Fessenden of Maine, later chairman of the well-known Joint Committee on Reconstruction, apparently expressed the prevailing opinion of the Senate when he said that:

> . . . it [the resolution] recognizes the fact of the seats being vacant, and to be filled by those States whenever they choose to fill them. That suits my idea of the exact state of the case, and is respectful to the States themselves. . . . It is holding that there are seats here at their disposal, at any time when they choose to fill them, whether by one man or another, these same gentlemen or others, or leave them vacant, just as they please upon that subject.

In vain did Senator J. M. Mason of Virginia, a Southern sympathizer, oppose the declaration that the seats were "vacant", because it did imply that the states in question still formed a part of the United States.[10]

[9] *Sen. Journal*, 36 Cong., 2 sess., pp. 131-132; *Cong. Globe*, pp. 500-502. It is interesting to note that seventeen of the twenty-two negative votes were cast by representatives of states later to become members of the Confederacy, and of border states.

[10] *Sen. Journal*, 36 Cong., special called session, pp. 416-418; *Cong. Globe*, pp. 1454-1455. No vote was given on the resolution; but the expected sectional character of the division may be seen in the yea and nay vote marking the defeat of a proposed amend-

The Senate resolutions and expressions of opinion given above merely harmonized, of course, with the idea of the indestructibility of the states, generally held by all branches of the United States government at the beginning of the conflict. Although after the collapse of the Confederacy the Senate (not to mention the House of Representatives) was not so willing for the Southern states to fill their seats in that body "whenever they choose" or "at their own time and in their good pleasure", as a body it did not deny the existence of those seats. A specific declaration of policy to the contrary was made on June 23, 1868, in connection with the discussions relative to the selection by Arkansas of Alexander McDonald for the term ending March, 1871, and B. F. Rice for the term ending March, 1873. Senator George F. Edmunds of Vermont, then near the beginning of his long career in the Senate, asked for information about the matter of electing senators to definite terms of less than six years. Assuming that the government of the Southern states had been completely disorganized, would it not be proper, he inquired, for the Senate to proceed by lot to classify their senators in accordance with the Constitution. Senator Lyman Trumbull of Illinois, to whom the inquiry pointedly was directed, replied in the manner of one who finds an idea difficult to phrase, because so simple and obvious. Speaking wholly extemporaneously on the subject he said:

> Arkansas was a State of the Union, and the terms of her Senators were fixed when Arkansas was admitted into the Union as commencing at a particular time. The period of six years for which each one serves is a fixed period; and it is no matter whether Arkansas had Senators a portion of this time or not. Suppose that her government had not been disorganized, but for some reason or other she had had no Senators for a dozen years; still the periods would run on, commencing and terminating at a particular point of time, which could be ascertained with certainty by going back to the first drawing of terms by her Senators when the State was admitted. I have not looked to see, but I take it for granted that these persons [McDonald and Rice] are elected to fill out terms which have already commenced. Perhaps the term of one Senator will terminate on the 4th of March, 1869, and the other on the 4th of March, 1873. I do not know how that may be in this case; but these are fixed terms, and there being no Senators to fill the terms which expire on those days, and Arkansas having now got into a position that authorizes her to elect Senators, she elects them to fill out those terms which have already commenced to run.[11]

One final statement may be noted. The occasion was the debate,

ment that those senators, "having ceased to be members of the Senate", be dropped from the roll. The individuals in question were Judah P. Benjamin, A. G. Brown, C. C. Clay, jr., Jefferson Davis, S. R. Mallory, and Robert Toombs. The terms of other senators who had withdrawn prior to this time expired on Mar. 4, 1861.

[11] *Cong. Globe*, 40 Cong., 2 sess., p. 3386.

July 22, 1868, relative to the exact time when the salary payments should start for the recently admitted senators from the states of Arkansas, Florida, Louisiana, North Carolina, and South Carolina. Speaking of these members, Senator Fessenden said:

> Some of them come here merely to fill out a vacant term that has been vacant all the time. For instance, they come here during the third Congress of the term instead of [the] first. Nobody was here from the State at the first, and nobody at the second . . .[12]

These views on the continuity of the classes in the Senate, applicable in the case of the representation from these Southern states, were not so much as challenged on the floor. As has been noted, too, it was on this principle that the senators were admitted from all the ex-Confederate states. In that respect, then, they certainly were not regarded in the light of territories, much less conquered provinces. The fact that the Southern states after the War were permitted to fill vacant seats in the United States Senate instead of electing members to new positions may be considered, it seems, as bolstering up in some small measure at least the opinion that despite the radical character of the Reconstruction process these states were regarded as never having been out of the Union.[13] Nor is any importance that may be attached to this *modus operandi* to be minimized because it was followed simply as a matter of course, and not adopted as a carefully planned policy. Rather, if significant at all, that circumstance must be regarded as having the opposite effect.

R. Earl McClendon.

Sam Houston State Teachers College.

[12] *Cong. Globe*, 40 Cong., 2 sess., p. 4457. It was finally agreed, as Fessenden wished, that the salaries should start, not from the beginning of the 40th Congress, or Mar. 4, 1867, as was proposed, but from the time the states in each case were declared entitled to representation. This, it was felt, would be consistent with the practice in ordinary cases when members were absent from the Senate for long periods of time. *Ibid.*, pp. 4459, 4461-4462.

[13] The reader is reminded here that William Archibald Dunning stated that the "process of military reconstruction, in its leading features, follows closely the lines of the theory of state suicide". *Essays on the Civil War and Reconstruction* (New York, 1904), p. 122. Andrew C. McLaughlin says that "it is *probably* [italics mine] correct to say that on the whole the idea that the states were utterly wiped out could not and did not prevail". *A Constitutional History of the United States* (New York, 1935), p. 650. See, however, John W. Burgess, *Reconstruction and the Constitution, 1866-1876* (New York, 1902), pp. 110-111.

DOCUMENTS

The Flight of Capital from Revolutionary France

In the Argenteau Collection of the Library of Congress[1] may be found interesting illustrations of the flight of capital from a country disorganized by civil strife and menaced by a flood of paper money. This aspect of the French Revolution has not been much noticed by historians of the subject. It is not proposed here to fill the gap or to give even a brief sketch of the financial affairs of a famous ambassador, Count Mercy-Argenteau, but simply to illustrate the growth of alarm in the minds of a typical group when France adopted the issue of assignats or land scrip as the solution of her financial problem.

Count Mercy-Argenteau was a man of great wealth, according to the standards of the eighteenth century. His normal income ran to 300,000 livres a year, not including his salary of 45,000 florins or 110,000 livres.[2] He possessed estates in northern France and in the Low Countries. In 1772 and 1775 he had bought two of exceptional value, one near and one at Conflans-Sainte-Honorine in the valley of the Oise, not far from Paris. One of these two, Neuville, he sold in November, 1790, for 340,000 livres (no. I). He had also bought in 1776 a large plantation in St. Domingo at a cost of 700,000 livres. Although he expected handsome profits from this, his principal income came from securities. He had a million invested in *rentes,* the most of it in *rentes viagères sur des têtes génevoises,* a form of loan more profitable to the investor than to the government which borrowed the money.[3] He had large holdings in other government loans, described in the letters as the "125 M" and the "80 M". There were also loans on the clergy and on the Estates of

[1] This collection was acquired in 1913, 1915, and 1918, and illustrates many phases of eighteenth century history. It came from the family archives in the chateau of Argenteau d'Ochain near Liége. The correspondence from which the selections are made owed its inception to the absence of Mercy-Argenteau from Paris after October 9, 1790, first as delegate to the congress at The Hague for the affairs of the Austrian Netherlands, recently in revolt, next as minister plenipotentiary or actual administrator at Brussels, in the absence of the governors general, the Archduchess Marie Christine and her husband, and, finally, awaiting the turn of events in France.

[2] Comte de Pimodan, *Le comte F. C. de Mercy-Argenteau* (Paris, 1911), p. 133. According to a statement preserved in the correspondence of Count Mercy's financial secretary, Dunkel, his estimated income for 1790 was approximately 475,000 livres.

[3] Marcel Marion, *Histoire financière de la France depuis 1715* (Paris, 1914), I, 297-298.

Brittany. He held a large block of stock in the unhappy Caisse d'Escompte, which he sold in October, 1790, for 552,735 livres, at a net loss of 115,080. The proceeds were invested in shares of the East India Company, and they in turn were sold during a flurry in December at a substantial profit, although not as great as might have been realized a few days later.

For the purposes of this study the letters of Mercy-Argenteau's private secretary, Wolfgang Kruthoffer, are of chief importance. Next come the letters of the count's most intimate friend, the Marquis Joseph de Laborde, a leading member of the financial aristocracy of the Old Regime and as such destined to face the Revolutionary Tribunal in 1794.[4] Three letters are from the correspondence of Dunkel, a financial secretary, and two from the Bethmans, a mercantile house in Bordeaux. Mercy-Argenteau's own letters are letter-press copies. They begin only with the letter of October 11, 1791. The tenor of his earlier letters, in reply to proposals of Kruthoffer or Laborde, may be easily inferred from the comments in their letters, and it is the attitude of these advisers, in immediate contact with the situation, which is most important.

Evidently the first problem of Count Mercy's advisers was to get his capital in more liquid form. Acting for him Laborde sold nearly all the securities except the *rentes viagères,* credited his friend with the proceeds, and proposed to use the assignats obtained in paying his other creditors or persons who had amounts on deposit in his banking house (nos. II and V). Count Mercy also had large deposits with another house, Boyd, Ker, and Company, profits of the sale of sugar from the plantation and proceeds from the disposal of the East India Company shares. The question arose, What to do with these amounts, approximately two million livres (note 14), as well as with other sums which might accrue later? Here the excerpts may tell the story. The selections are not carried beyond the outbreak of war between France and Austria on April 20, 1792, because then other considerations enter and the correspondence of Kruthoffer and Count Mercy is mainly devoted to plans for salvaging personal effects, furnishings, wines, etc. Only those passages of the correspondence are given which are pertinent to the subject.

The attempt has been made to transcribe the letters exactly, preserving peculiarities of spelling, accent, and punctuation or the lack of it.

H. E. B.

[4] Henri Wallon, *Le Tribunal Révolutionnaire* (Paris, 1881), III, 249-251.

I KRUTHOFFER TO MERCY-ARGENTEAU

Paris le 25 9^{bre} 1790

La lettre dont Votre Excellence m'a honoré en date du 19 de ce mois m'est parvenue avanthier, et je n'ai pas perdu un instant pour en suivre l'objet. j'ai enfin la satisfaction de pouvoir Lui annoncer la Vente de Neuville au prix de Trois cent quarante mille Livres . . . dont 150/m seront payées comptant soit en passant contrat, soit après l'obtention des lettres de ratification. M. Bermon a promis verbalement de fournir, en payant le premier terme, autant d'espèces sonnantes qu'il pourra se procurer; mais il n'a pas été possible de stipuler cette clause dans l'acte, parceque tacitement en opposition avec le decret de l'assemblée nationale sur les assignats, cette clause auroit été annullée à la première reclamation, ce qui, en cas de décés de M. Bermon, auroit pu arriver de la part de ses héritiers. . . .

De Votre Excellence

Le très humble et très-obéissant

Serviteur KRUTHOFFER

II LABORDE TO MERCY-ARGENTEAU

. . . . La vente des biens devenus Nationnaux sont cause de la hausse qui deviendra permanente. on va payer en Janvier l année 1790 des rentes et en Juillet les 6 premiers mois de 1791. tout cela avec le rembourseme- des offices va repandre un torrent d'assignats—qui va embarasser bien du monde pour placer—la fortune ou le superflus des revenus: une portion du Royaume veut des terres, une autre n en veut pas—L assignat est une pierre qui ne produit pas du revenu—Il faut donc le placer ou en terre ou en produit d un Interet: je suis convencu avec les personnes qui ont la confiance de votre Excellence d atandre la hausse des effets qui parait certaine. On pourra les negotier avec benefice. alors s'il convient a votre Excellence de les vendre, et d en faire verser le produit chez moi et de n avoir de debiteur par contrat a cinq pour cent sans retenu que moi; je serais aux ordres de votre Excellence parceque je rembourserai avec les assignats des personnes aux quelles je dois et aux quelles la Loi me permet de rembourser en assignats ce qui peut vous eviter la perte de realiser en especes: mais en realisant en especes Il faut encore placer et on est fort embarassé

Les changes sur Londres donent une perte seche de 16 pour cent et les 3 per cent consolidés sont a près de 80—de sorte que pour placer a Londres a 3 3/4 on commence par perdre sur le change 16 pour cent. . . .

en priant votre excellence d en

recevoir L expression—[5]

Le 9. X^{re} 1790

III LABORDE TO MERCY-ARGENTEAU

. . . . J'ai causé avec les deux personnes—chargées ici des Interets particuliers de votre Excellence: elles sont d'avis de vendre le Petit objet de 125 m^{lls} a 15 pour cent de benefice et celui de l'emprunt National l'orsqu'il ne donera pas de perte et qu'on trouvera les Interets: je suis du meme avis: cependant comme on va se trouver embarassé pour placer cette charmante

[5] Nearly all of the Laborde letters close with expressions of devoted friendship, but are not signed. Laborde rarely inserts an apostrophe where the vowel of the article is elided before the initial vowel of a noun and usually runs the two together. They are here separated.

Monnoye d assignats: je veux voir encore la tournure que la bourse va prendre cette semaine avant de livrer la negotiation a l agent de change: on va toucher les interets des deux effets, et je suis persuadé que les 125 m[lls] après avoir recu les 5 pour cent d interet s etabliront a 10 p c et l emprunt National au pair Je me conduirai pour la negotiation avec plus de crainte & de reflection que si cela me regardoit

quand aux fonds de votre Excellence on les versera dans ma caisse. Les Interets seront bonifiés a cinq pour cent en dedans, comme par le passé, et a mesure que votre Excellence trouvera convenable d en disposer pour les placer partout où cela lui sera agreable. . . .

Ce 3. janvier 1791

IV KRUTHOFFER TO MERCY-ARGENTEAU

. . . . J'ai remis sans retard à M. de la Borde la lettre qui lui étoit destinée. . . . Nous avons ensuite parlé de ses affaires de finance, et il m'a appris que ce matin les billets des 125 Mill. avoient été vendus savoir 10. à 10 1/2. 10 à 10. et 58. à 9 7/8 pct. de bénéfice les intérêts prélevés. Des circonstances majeures ayant fait craindre un mouvement retrograde à la bourse, dont le premier effet s'est montré aujourdhui, ont déterminé M. de la Borde à réaliser, et ce même motif l'a engagé à suivre ce plan a l'égard de l'emprunt national, qu'il a donné commission de négocier à un demi, trois quarts, même un pour cent de perte, les intérêts prélevés, parceque le bénéfice fait sur les 125 Mill. en servira de dedommagement. Je n'ai pu qu'applaudir à cette sage mesure parcequ'elle est fondée sur les notions que M. de la Borde a puisées à la source, et dont le premier moteur n'échappera pas à la sagacité de Votre Ex[ce] Si, comme je l'espère cette opération se termine heureusement, tous ses fonds de cette nature seront à couvert, les actions des assurances contre les incendies étant également réalisées au plus haut cours qu'elles ayent eu à la bourse, et la quittance des finances de l'emprunt de 80 Mill. devant être remboursée incessamment avec quelques billets de lotterie à la caisse de l'extraordinaire.[6] . . . .

KRUTHOFFER

Paris le 7. Janvier 1791

V LABORDE TO MERCY-ARGENTEAU

. . . . M[r] Kruthoff m a dit que vous desirez d adjouter aux 600 de L . . .[7] autres 600; mais la circonstance n est rien moins que favorable et la perte seroit immense: les nouvelles de l inde n'ont pas causé qu une faible baisse, mais si la Politique force a des armemens pour le nord[8] cela pourra ocasioner des changemens d'ont Il faudra profiter: Il ne faut rien presser. . . . Je n ai vendu que 47 mille livres de l emprunt National J en avois doné 100 mille a [?] mon agent de change de confiance: je lui ai dit d' atandre pour les 53 le pair ou quelque benefice. les 500 m restants ne seront vendus qu'avec quelque benefice, l'ors que l emission des assignats commencera a engorger tout le monde

Il n i a rien à faire pour les biens du clergé—tout se vend a des prix qui

[6] A special fund in which the assignats were deposited and from which extraordinary expenditures were met.

[7] Paid in 1790 for £30,600 in consols.

[8] *Cambridge Modern History*, VIII, 294.

ne me convient pas de manière que pour employer les fonds de votre Excellence, & les miens qui seront enormes cette année par les rentes viageres et 900 mille livres de revenus que je ferai des mes habi[s][9] je prendrai le parti de rembourser une bonne partie de ce que je dois Cela n est pas aisé tout le monde m'accable de sollicitations pour que je garde l'argent. . . .

Ce 13. fevrier

VI KRUTHOFFER TO MERCY-ARGENTEAU

. . . . Il m'est venu une idée que je soumets à l'examen de Votre Ex[ce] Les troubles des Iles françoises[10] vont faire hausser le prix de leurs denrées: ne pourroit-on pas faire une spéculation avantageuse avec une bonne maison de Hollande ou de Hambourg sur les sucres, le caffé et même des Vins de Bordeaux et des Eaux de vie de france? Le débit de ces articles est sûr dans le Nord de l'Europe. Les fonds se trouveront ici pour solder l'acquisition, et les rentrées ne supporteront pas la perte du change.[11] . . .

KRUTHOFFER

Paris le 11 Mars 1791

VII LABORDE TO MERCY-ARGENTEAU

Je viens de voir Monsieur, le Comte la lettre que votre Excellence a ecrite le 23 de ce mois a M. Dunkel au sujet de vos capitaux: L operation d envoyer des denrées a amsterdam Hambourg &c auroit eté tres utille l année derniere surtout en sucres—mais depuis le mois d octobre ils sont augmenté de 25 o/o et il est impossible aujourdhui d'opérer sur cet article ni sur les caffés. d ailleurs les speculations en marchandises—surtout en vins et eaux de vies, sont sujets a tant d'avaries de coulage et d evenemens que cela convient qu aux personnes qui en font metier: et j avoue que je ne suis pas porté à des operations qui souvent sont dix huit mois à etre liquidés. . . .

Ce 27 Mars 1791

VIII DUNKEL TO MERCY-ARGENTEAU

Monseigneur!

. . . . Je me permet une observation. Si les demonstrations angloises deviennent une réalité, le desavantage du change pourra se compenser par la forte baisse qui dans ce cas la ne manquera pas d'avoir lieu: mais ce desavantage se compensera plus réellement, et de lui même à l'epoque (après la guerre) que Votre Excellence fera revenir ses fonds dans ce païs ci, puisqu'Elle recevra alors pour 25 1/4 deniers Sterling environ l'Ecu qu'Elle donne aujourd'hui pour 25 1/4 deniers sterling, à moins qu'il n'arrive aux finances angloises un malheur qu'il sera prudent de calculer avant que de rien entreprendre. Je n'y fait point entrer nos propres affaires persuadé qu'elles

[9] Plantation in St. Domingo.

[10] St. Domingo and the other French islands were on the verge of a slave insurrection.

[11] On March 20 Kruthoffer writes again that Dunkel had shown him Count Mercy's letter of March 16 in which Mercy had apparently endorsed such a scheme. Kruthoffer accordingly took the opinion of Laborde, which was unfavorable, as also appears from Laborde's own letter of March 27 (no. VII), which had special reference to another letter of Mercy to Dunkel written a week later than that of March 16. See no. IX for a fuller development of Kruthoffer's idea.

seront long tems les mêmes. Dieu veuille qu'elles n'empirent pas. . . .
Je suis avec le plus profond Respect
Monseigneur
De Votre Excellence
Le très-humble et très-obéissant
Serviteur DUNKEL [12]

Paris le 27 Mars 1791

IX KRUTHOFFER TO MERCY-ARGENTEAU

[Detailed analysis of French domestic situation]

. . . . Cependant je ne prétends pas mettre les finances du Royaume à l'abri de quelque crise, mais elle ne sera que passagere si les mécontens temporisent. le mal ne viendra que des agioteurs qui entretiennent adroitement la défiance générale pour faire reserrer les espèces; l'etablissement de l'impôt diminuera ce mal, et j'ai lieu de croire que le nouveau systeme d'impositions réussira parceque la plus forte charge pese sur le riche tandis que le pauvre est menagé . . . . la legislature prochaine pourra modifier d'autres branches d'impositions et en ce cas celles qui chargent le peuple auront la préférence; ce sera pour celui-ci un nouveau motif de chérir la révolution. À la vérité on s'attend à des difficultés dans la perception, mais on espère y suppléer par des assignats vû le haut prix qu'on retire des domaines nationaux, et avec le tems l'organisation de la force publique et peutetre le retablissement de l'autorité royale sous les législatures futures remedieront à ce mal passager. Ces reflexions peuvent tranquilliser les françois sur leurs fortunes; mais les etrangers ne peuvent avoir les mêmes motifs de confiance; la difficulté consiste à trouver un moyen d'exporter des capitaux sans perte: La spéculation qui j'ai eu l'honneur d'indiquer à Votre Ex^ce^ m'a paru lever cette difficulté. Voici quelle étoit mon idée: On auroit donné en commandite une forte somme à condition de retirer du bénéfice à faire d'abord les intérêts du Capital jusqu'à son arrivée à la banque de L. ensuite la moitié du restant; l'autre moitié du bénefice auroit appartenu à la Maison du commerce qui se seroit chargée seule de toute la correspondance et des soins que la réussite de la spéculation auroit exigés. Mais M. de la B. n'approuve pas ce projet. . . .

KRUTHOFFER

Paris le 28 Mars 1791

X LABORDE TO MERCY-ARGENTEAU

Je viens de recevoir Monsieur, le Comte la lettre dont vous m'avez honnoré le 31 du mois dernier. Je m empresse de repondre: Je ne suis pas porté en aucune maniere sur les speculations en denrées—d europe ni de L amerique: tant de gens du metier sont en concurrence qu'on a de la peine à realiser et à voir la fin—de semblables speculations qui sont toujours sujets à une infinite d inconveniens de délais et des fonds acrochés qu'il est impossible de manier

tout parait anoncer une baisse dans les fonds anglais pour avoir 4 p o/o il faut les acheter à 75: le Pair du change est d'environ 29 1/2 consequament il done sur 25 change actuel une perte d environ 18 p o/o mais pour l'eprouver il faudroit qu'à l epoque qu'on retireroit l argent de Londres que le change fut a 29 1/2 Ce qui n'est nulement vraisemblable: Il faut donc lorsqu'on veut pour sa tranquilité diviser sa fortune—et en porter une

[12] The other two Dunkel letters (nos. XVI and XVIII) are similarly subscribed.

partie à Londres oublier le change et profiter du moment d une baisse pour placer ses fonds a 4. ou mieux si cela est possible.

Cest a votre Excellence à se decider et a me doner ou faire doner ses ordres en limitant le prix auquel on devra acheter: et la somme à faire passer à Londres si elle doit exceder celle de 600/m qui sont chez M^rs^ Boyd Ker & C^e^ je fournirai de celle qui est chez moi et que je n'ai pris que pour tranquiliser mon ami. J atandrai vos ordres Monsieur, le Comte pour me conformer avec les soins de l amitié. . . .

Ce 7. avril—

XI KRUTHOFFER TO MERCY-ARGENTEAU

. . . . En acquittant les traites fournies par M. Millet [13] en assignats à envoyer d'ici aux correspondants de Votre Ex^ce^ et en chargeant ceux-ci de vendre ses sucres contre des lettres de change sur L. il me semble que le résultat de ces opérations seroit le même, c'est à dire que dans ce dernier cas il faudroit toujours supporter la perte du change, parceque les acheteurs évalueront toujours leurs traites sur L. suivant le cours de la place. . . .

J'en étois là avec ma lettre lorsqu'on m'a remis celle dont de Votre Ex^ce^ m'a honoré du 4 de ce mois: je l'ai communiqué sur le champ à M. de la B. qui a ajouté une apostille au billet collé ci-dessus. Je La prie de fixer la somme qu'Elle voudra employer: Ne pourroit-pas Elle l'elever jusqu'à un million pour revendre lors de la hausse pour 400/m le bénéfice qui en résultera couvrira en parti la perte sur le change pour les 600/m qui resteront à L. car il n'est pas probable que le change s'élève de sitôt au pair. . . .[14]

KRUTHOFFER

Paris le 8 Avril 1791

XII KRUTHOFFER TO MERCY-ARGENTEAU

Je viens d'avoir une longue conférence avec M. de Romberg [15] sur le genre de spéculations à faire en ce moment et sur les moyens de les rendre utiles. Ce négociant m'a répeté les mêmes reflexions dont il a eu l'honneur de faire part à Votre Excellence. Le succès de pareilles opérations conduites avec prudence lui paroit assuré; voici les articles que suivant son opinion il faudroit préférer.

1°. Le coton du Levant. Suivant les dernieres lettres cette marchandise est maintenant en hausse à Marseille; mais quand même elle se soutiendroit,

[13] Agent in St. Domingo.

[14] According to a later letter of Kruthoffer (April 16) Laborde, after reading Mercy-Argenteau's letter of April 10 to Kruthoffer, decided to employ a million livres in this speculation. Laborde instructed Messrs. Harman Hoare not to pay over 75 for the three per cents. At the time when this transaction was under way Count Mercy had on deposit, as appears from a report of Dunkel on April 14, with Laborde the sum of 1,010,658 livres, 4 sous, and with Boyd Ker, 871,694 livres, 17 sous, 3 deniers. These sums came from the sale of Count Mercy's securities and from his annuities (*rentes viagères*). The money was forwarded to the London bankers in two drafts, the first for £22,787, costing 666,285 livres, 4 sous, and the second for £14,818 14*s.* 8*d.*, costing 452,568 livres, 2 sous 9 deniers. The money appears to have remained on deposit in London some time before the additional three per cents were bought. The losses on exchange were heavy. Laborde on May 24 tried to reassure Count Mercy by saying that if the funds were brought back to Paris at that date the profit would be 180,000 livres (in assignats!).

[15] Of Ostende; see note 17.

il y auroit encore une bonne spéculation à faire parceque cet article est d'un débit sûr dans toute l'Europe, et que le coton des Iles a manqué. Il n'y a pas un moment à perdre pour acheter, et il faudra commencer par cette opération si Votre Ex^ce^ décide à tenter des spéculations de ce genre.

2°. Les caffés de St. Domingue. Cette denrée est à un prix moyen. les nouveaux renforts qu'on attend au mois de juin peuvent causer une baisse dont il faudroit profiter à l'instant même, et se tenir au bon commun destiné pour la consommation du peuple parceque le débit en est sûr.

3°. Les Eaux de vie surtout celles de Cette qui sont les plus recherchées partout oú cette liqueur se débite. On se prépare en août et 7^bre^ pour en faire les achats, et si les prix sont mitoyens, on ne risque jamais que de gagner sur cette spéculation.

M. de Romberg se propose de conduire lui même toutes les opérations avec la commission de 2 pour o/o. Pour éviter le nom de Votre Excellence soit connu, toutes les spéculations se feroient en celui de la personne qu'elle désignera. . . . Les payemens se feroient ou chez un banquier à Paris ou par des envois d'assignats adressés directement aux commissionnaires dans les ports où se feront les achats. . . . Les ventes se feroient par courtier ou par vente publique au comptant ou à de courts termes et M. de Romberg répondroit de la rentrée des fonds moyennant un pour cent en sus de la commission *dû croire* ou pour cette garantie. . . .

. . . . Quand même il n'en résulteroit qu'un bénéfice modique, il serviroit à couvrir en partie la perte sur des remises précédentes, et celles-ci echapperoient à la perte énorme du change. Ce capital mis ainsi en mouvement se retrouveroit ensuite à Bruxelles et il s'agira alors d'en fixer l'emploi. . . .[16]

KRUTHOFFER

Paris le 6. Mai 1791

Bordeaux le 18 Mai 1791

XIII BETHMAN AND FILS TO KRUTHOFFER

En nous référant à la lettre particulière que nôtre Sieur Bethman père eut l'honneur de vous écrire le 2 avril nous avons celui de vous dire que si vôtre ami persiste dans l'intention d'employer ses fonds en denrées américaines nous approchons du moment le plus convenable pour réaliser cette spéculation. Le caffé est l'article qui nous semble mériter la préférence, comme étant celui dont les prix ont été moins forcés. Nous sommes à la veille de recevoir des renforts considérables à l'arrivée desquels les prix de cette fève subiront toute la diminution dont ils peuvent être susceptibles et c'est ce moment que nous saisirons pour frapper notre coup si vôtre ami se décide à

[16] Bethman had already written to Kruthoffer on April 2 that the time had passed to buy colonial goods, and that the prices of sugar and cotton had been pushed up excessively. He thinks that by July sugar and coffee will fall, and that the risk will not be as great. To the letter from which the selections above are taken Kruthoffer added a memorandum, reminding Comte Mercy-Argenteau that Laborde had always been opposed to his going into such speculations, and emphasizing the need of inquiring into the stability of the Romberg house which had suffered some losses in Paris. The amount finally indicated for a venture, presumably in coffee, was 100,000 *écus*. This according to a letter of Kruthoffer was to be drawn from funds with Boyd Ker, which Mercy-Argenteau wished to reduce to the minimum, because he was dissatisfied with the practices of this banking house. Special care was to be used in forwarding to Bordeaux the successive remittances of assignats, the mails not being secure.

nous confier le soin de ses intérêts que nous menagerions avec le plus grand zêle. . . .[17]

Monsieur!

Son très humble et très obeissant Serviteur
BETHMAN & FILS

XIV KRUTHOFFER TO MERCY-ARGENTEAU

. . . . Le discrédit des assignats n'est pas assez prochain pour qu'il y ait une catastrophe à craindre. le prix de l'argent est tombé de 21 à 8 pct. C'est la suite des echanges qu'on fait à un taux inférieur aux pauvres ouvriers dans plusieurs caisses établies par des sections. D'ailleurs M. Dunckel ne garde en caisse que la somme nécessaire aux dépenses courantes. . . . Les petits assignats de Cent Sols et la monnoie de billon dont l'emmission est prochaine, remedieront aux embarras du moment. . . .

KRUTHOFFER

Paris le 27 Mai, 1791

XV KRUTHOFFER TO MERCY-ARGENTEAU

Paris, le 1er Juin, 1791

. . . . Le discrédit des assignats est de fort mauvais augure; cependant il me paroit que ce discrédit tient moins à la crainte du retour de l'ancien régime qui anéantiroit leur hypotheque, qu'à la rareté actuelle du numeraire et l'agiotage usuraire dont tout le monde se mêle au mepris des vertus civiques inutilement prêchées par l'assemblée . . . . quelle qu'en soit l'issue, on peut être certain que les biens appartenants aux maisons religieuses ne retourneront jamais à leurs anciens propriétaires . . . Cette spéculation enhardit les acquereurs, mais ils comptent en même tems sur la rentrée des impositions, parcequ'il y auroit tout à craindre des abus dans l'emission forcée de nouveaux assignats pour combler annuellement un deficit aussi énorme que seroit celui de la non-perception d'une partie des impôts. . . .

. . . . des observateurs plus attentifs à suivre les intrigues qui vont décider des elections, annoncent avec assurance que cette législature sera plus democrate que l'ancienne. . . . Il semble que cette opinion détermine les etrangers à poursuivre la retraite de leurs fonds même avec perte. Voici un nouveau genre de spéculation qui a été utilement employé: on achete avec des assignats les Piastres arrivant à Bayonne; leur dernier cours étoit de six francs la pièce. On exporte ces piastres qui comme monnoie etrangere n'est pas dans le cas de la loi, et leur valeur est plus sure que celle d'autres marchandises dont les placemens sont moins faciles. Les retours arrivés de la Havanne à Cadix vont bientôt ranimer ce commerce. Je propose cette spéculation à Votre Exce M. de la B. qui connoit ce négoce mieux que personne peut diriger et ordonner les opérations; les envois se feroient à L. ou dans tel autre lieu que Votre Exce désignera. La conversion d'assignats en nouvelle monnoie de billon est possible, mais sujette à de lenteurs car on ne pourra echanger que les petits assignats de 5# et il est probable que quoiqu'on espère de cet expédient, bientôt l'echange ne se fera pas au pair. On pourroit

[17] From Kruthoffer letters of June 29 and July 8 it appears that Mercy-Argenteau changed his mind in regard to the speculation, but Bethman had already gone ahead to the extent of buying 45,422 lbs. at 18 sous, which had been forwarded to Mrs Fr. Romberg et fils & Ricourt at Ostende. In the letter of July 8 Kruthoffer asks whether the count wishes to proceed further.

employer ce moyen, mais le plus sûr sera toujours de ne pas accumuler les assignats dans le portefeuille. . . .[18]

KRUTHOFFER

XVI DUNKEL TO MERCY-ARGENTEAU

Monseigneur

. . . . Le changement de la situation chez M^rs^ Boyd-Ker dependra des operations de M^rs^ Bethman. . . . (Ne seroit il pas convenable de faire passer autre part les remises qui nous viennent du dehors?) Enfin de la perception des Rentes, qui je pense ne rentreront gueres avant le mois d'octobre. L'ensemble fera une somme considerable, que mon opinion personelle sur les affaires ne me permet point de conseiller à Votre Excellence de garder dans ce pays ci. Je desirerois qu'Elle substituât à ses fonds simplement une Lettre de Credit sur la Maison de M^rs^ Boyd-Ker pour nos besoins de france, afin que si par une fatalité inevitable nous devons avoir le malheur, que les uns craignent, et dont les autres rient, d' etre enveloppés dans une catastrophe, nous aÿons au moins sauvé ce qui à tems a dependu de nous de mettre en sureté. . . .

DUNKEL

Paris le 13. Juin 1791

XVII KRUTHOFFER TO MERCY-ARGENTEAU

. . . . Je vais ecrire à M. Brethous à Marseille pour lui demander les prix des cotons du Levant et celles des drogues pour lesquelles il n'y a pas d'avaries à craindre dans le transport. Je prie Votre Ex^ce^ d'ordonner des informations sur les prix courants de ces articles dans le païs qu'Elle va habiter, afin qu'on puisse y proportionner le prix d'achats. . . .

L'agiotage acquiert journellement plus d'activité; le numeraire devient plus rare de jour en jour; on accapare jusqu'à la monnoie de cuivre; pour les plus menus payemens on se trouve dans le plus grand embarras. j'ignore si l'ass: mettra ordre à ce brigandage. . . .[19]

KRUTHOFFER

Paris le 3 Août 1791

XVIII DUNKEL TO MERCY-ARGENTEAU

Monseigneur!

. . . . Je me sers de tout moÿen en mon pouvoir à echanger au pair mes gros assignats contre de. petits de 50,60., operation trop genée par l'infame agiotage, qui malheureusement va toujours en augmentant. Les assignats de 200,300#, et quelquefois de 500# encore s'echangent à 1 p o/o les 1000 & 2000# a 1 1/2 2 p o/o de perte contre les petits de 50 a 100#, mais l'echange des petits assignats de 50 a 100# en assignats de 100 sols ou 5# est porté jusqu'à 8 p o/o de perte. La Monnoie journellement exportée de paris dans ses environs devient tellement rare que pour changer un Ecu de 6# on demande un agio de 6 à 12 sols. Si l'assemblée Nationale se hâte à faire une emission majeure, d'une douzaine de millions, d'assignats de 5# à la

[18] On this new copper coinage, see Marion, II, 275 ff.

[19] In a letter of August 4 Kruthoffer writes that assignats are as against *écus* at 20 to 21 o/o loss. "Il y a beaucoup de personnes qui aiment mieux sacrifier un cinquieme de leur fortune que de garder ce papier dont le discrédit augmente. Les effets à la bourse ont baisse de 3 à 4 pct."

fois, à procurer au commerce de paris de gros sols pour quelques cent mille livres, et pour autant de pieces de 5, 10, 15 et 30 sols, elle nous deliverera d'une très grande inquiétude pour la tranquilité publique, le mecontentement causé par l'extreme penurie de petites especes étant à son comble. . . .

Ce total de 460,109. 17. 3. [now on deposit with Boyd Ker, including sums soon to come in] semble une somme trop considerable (pour un seul article) pour ne pas craindre de très fortes longueurs pour la defaite de la denrée. Il est cependant à considerer que le change passe à notre desavantage 20 p o/o; que les produits successifs de la Denrée, au pair, ou presqu' au pair des sommes depensées en assignats fournissent du Comptant, et que celui ci à son retour en france doit profiter du benefice d'un change quelconque. Cette consideration jointe à l'article de la Sureté peuvent peut être tenir la balance aux désagréments d'attente ci dessus, et porter Votre Excellence à une decision ferme et finale. . . .

DUNKEL

Paris le 9 Aoust 1791

XIX KRUTHOFFER TO MERCY-ARGENTEAU

. . . . M. Hoppé[20] m'apprend que Votre Ex^ce^ va faire une course en Angleterre; Ne pourroit-Elle pas y chercher une bonne maison de commerce pour une spéculation sur les Eaux de vie de france? je connois un négociant dans l'Angoumois qui étant propriétaire et fermier de plusieurs terres est à portée de fournir des eaux de vie à tel degré qu'on les demandera, à des prix inférieurs à ceux des Commissionnaires des ports de france. je prends la liberté de faire cette proposition à Votre Ex^ce^ pour accéllerer le placement des assignats qui vont s'augmenter incessamment. . . .

KRUTHOFFER

Paris le 10 Août 1791

XX KRUTHOFFER TO MERCY-ARGENTEAU

. . . . Il devient donc plus essentiel que jamais d'aviser aux moyens de se debarrasser des assignats; mais le seul moyen qui se présente avec le moins de perte, est de les convertir en marchandises. Je vais avoir l'honneur d'exposer à Votre Ex^ce^ l'embarras où je me trouve à cet égard. le prix du change à l'etranger baisse journellement, et celui des articles du commerce françois hausse dans la même proportion. Les caffés ordinaires sont a Bordeaux à 20 s. la livre; les nouvelles de St. Domingue en multipliant les demandes vont les faire hausser encore.[21] On me mande de Marseille que les changes sur l'etranger étant au desavantage de la france d'environ 25 o/o il ne faut pas s'attendre à une baisse des articles que ce port peut fournir. Voici ceux des cotons en laine de Smirne I^ere^ qualité 120#. 2^e^ qualite 115# livres le quintal, l'escompte en payant comptant est d'un à deux pour o/o.

[20] Mercy-Argenteau's secretary, with him in Brussels.

[21] Kruthoffer remarks that Mercy-Argenteau can determine from the prices obtained at Ostende by the sales of the first lot of coffee "à quel prix Elle pourra par ce moyen convertir ses assignats et en toucher le montant en espèces hors de france". A letter of Sept. 21 indicates the decision of Mercy-Argenteau, for Kruthoffer reports that he has ordered Bethman to profit by the first fall in the price "pour employer le capital indiqué en caffé, savoir 50 à 60 m. en *bon triage* en cas que la différence de prix de cette qualité soit notablement moindre que le prix du *bon ordinaire* ou *marchand*, que je lui ai fixé à 18 au plus haut à 19 s. tournois".

Le prix de coton de St. Domingue qui ne paroit pas devoir baisser est de 180 à 185#. le quintal, escompte 2 à 3 p. o/o comptant. quant aux articles de drogues, on me mande qu'aucun ne peut convenir. . . .

Votre Ex^ce^ en adoptant ce genre de spéculations a calculé sur un bénéfice quelconque ou du moins sur la rentrée de ses fonds au pair. Suivant les prix indiqués ci-dessus, il est impossible d'y parvenir, et une perte de 8 à 10 p. o/o, peutêtre davantage, aura lieu sur quelqu'article on veuille spéculer. . . .

M. Dunckel s'est expliqué avec M^rs^ B. K. au sujet des assignats en cas de discrédit, et en cas de remboursement il a insisté sur une bonification pour les sommes fournies en espèces. Ils n'ont point adopté cette distinction,—parceque ces sommes en especes leur arrivent en traites qu'on paye à Paris en assignats. En cas d'événemens sinistres il faudroit donc courir la chance commune à tous, et cela devient un nouveau motif de diminuer la somme qui se trouve chez ces Messieurs sur Compte courant. . . .

KRUTHOFFER

Paris le 26 Août 1791

XXI MERCY-ARGENTEAU TO KRUTHOFFER

. . . . Vos arrangements avec M^rs^ Bethmann sont tres bien pris nous en attendrons l'issue—je vous mandrai celle de la vente de mes sucres sans doute ils ne seront pas debiter au prix des Ports de France mais aussi on ne païera pas en assignats prenez bien garde a cette dangereuse monnoÿe et pensez toujours au moment prochain ou elle ne servira plus qu'a faire des Papillotes. . . .[22]

Brus: Le 11 8^bre^

XXII MERCY-ARGENTEAU TO KRUTHOFFER

. . . . Le I^re^ envoi de mon caffé a été vendû a ostende a 8^sols^ 1/4 ce qui doit me rendre mon argent au Pair . . .[23] il seroit bien important que M^rs^ Bethmann eut pû faire d'autres achats, car il ne faut pas compter sur les speculations a l'orient. . . .

L'essentiel est toujours de nous debarrasser de nos assignats et de calculer sur les apparances trop vraisemblables, que l on finira par une Banqueroute de laquelle il est important de sauver ce que l on pourra. . . .

Le 5 9^bre^ 1791

XXIII KRUTHOFFER TO MERCY-ARGENTEAU

. . . . M. Hoppé m'a donné le résultat de la vente de la premiere partie

[22] This is the earliest letter of Count Mercy of which the Mercy-Argenteau collection has a copy. Before he received this letter Kruthoffer had written Count Mercy that he was sending 200 m. to Bethman for the general operation, leaving with Boyd Ker only 50 m. The reference to sugar is explained by the decision to forward the sugar which arrived to his account from St. Domingo to Ostend, rather than dispose of it in France. In a letter of Oct. 16 Count Mercy says that he is willing for Bethman to sell the sugar in Bordeaux if he converts the proceeds into other merchandise or pays Millet for slaves the purchase of which he had authorized. He then regarded this as an excellent means of getting rid of the assignats, but by November, when he realized the situation in St. Domingo, he changed his mind about buying slaves (letter of Nov. 16). In the letter of Oct. 16 he again complains of Boyd Ker for proposing to pay him in assignats however low their value may be.

[23] See notes 17 and 21. According to the next letter, from Kruthoffer, the sale netted a heavy loss.

de caffé à Ostende, qui offre une forte perte. Les frais de commissionnaires me paroissent exorbitans, et je présume qu'ils se font payer la garantie des recouvremens à part de leur commission. Ce mauvais succès n'est pas d'un heureux présage pour les opérations futures, et cependant il faut se résoudre à des sacifices ou s'exposer à la chance incertaine des assignats. Aucun article du commerce françois n'offre en ce moment des spéculations utiles parceque tous les etrangers pressés de réaliser et d'exporter leurs fonds se nuisent réciproquement par leur concurrence en achetant et en revendant. . . .

KRUTHOFFER

Paris le 23 9$^{b:e}$ 1791

XXIV KRUTHOFFER TO MERCY-ARGENTEAU

. . . . Quant aux spéculations futures voici comme il [Bethman, Nov. 19] s'en explique.

> Dans ce moment je ne vois nul article à placer vos assignats solidement que par Contrat sur des bienfonds et payables dans 5.6. 7. 8 à 10 ans, avec l'intérêt annuel; d'ici là et même plutôt l'argent reparoitra et les changes rehausseront. Quelques particuliers d'Hollande ont ici de l'argent qu'ils donnent ordre de placer au taux de 5 pct. soit sur des bienfonds en france ou dans nos Colonies, et je crois leur spéculation bien fondée.
>
> Je vous dirai en confidence et que vous pourrez faire passer à S: Ex^{ce} que M^{rs} Walkiers de Vlieringhe et de Gammarage doivent ici 4 à 500/m sur leurs billets, et ils cherchent à emprunter sur hypotheque pour plusiurs années; comme S: E: les connoit particulierement, elle pourroit peut être y placer solidement sur leurs terres et employer ses assignats. . . .[24]

Les assignats qui restent chez M^{rs} Boyd Ker avec les produits des sucres vendus au Havre et à vendre à Bordeaux pourront rendre la moitié de la somme que ces M^{rs} cherchent à emprunter, en cas que Votre Ex^{ce} goute la proposition de M. Bethman; dans le cas contraire je La prierai de vouloir bien en faire part à M. le Baron de Thugut qui cherche à mettre à couvert environ 450/m qu'il a en effets royaux et auquel cet emploi pourroit convenir.

KRUTHOFFER

Paris le 26 Novembre 1791

XXV BETHMAN TO KRUTHOFFER

Bordeaux du 6 X^{bre} 1791

Je prends la liberté de vous consulter si vous croyez que Son Excellence ne trouveroit pas mauvais, Supposé qu'elle adopte mon idée de preter à M^{rs} W. de V. et de G. une certaine somme pour 5 ans, à rendre sans intérêts le capital en Ecus de six livres ou en or, si elle ne trouveroit pas mauvais, dis-je, que je la suplie de m'y comprendre pour 120/m que j'ai entre les mains pour mes petits enfants et ma fille et que je veux réaliser et transporter. . . .

B

[24] In a letter of November 30 Mercy-Argenteau asks for further details, fearing that the money was to be paid back in assignats or that the mortgages given in security would be on French lands. See modification of proposal in next letter (Dec. 6), Bethman to Kruthoffer.

XXVI KRUTHOFFER TO MERCY-ARGENTEAU

. . . . J'ai demandé a M. Bethman des eclaircissemens précis sur les placemens proposés; ma lettre a croisé celle qu'il m'a ecrite du 6 de ce mois et qui est ci-jointe. . . . Votre Ex^ce^ remarquera dans lad^e^ lettre de M. de Bethman que le placement en question pour être remboursé après cinq ans en espèces sonnantes, doit se faire *sans interêts* et qu'en cas de prêt à cette condition il desireroit qu'Elle l'y interessât pour 120/m. Par une lettre antérieure M. Bethman m'avoit déja annoncé ce genre de placement adopté depuis peu par de gros Capitalistes Suisses qui après avoir epuisé toutes les spéculations s'arrêtent à celle ci pour sauver une partie de leur fortune du naufrage qui menace les assignats. Ce sacrifice est grand; Votre Ex^ce^ pourra-t-Elle s'y resoudre? J'attends des nouvelles de Marseille sur le prix des cotons de Smirne; c'est la derniere Corde de mon arc: Si le retablissement de la bonne harmonie avec la Régence d'Alger a rendu ces prix tant soit peu raisonnables, je serois tenté d'y employer tout ce que nous avons d'assignats, car il ne paroit pas probable que la perte s'élève à 25 pct. quand même elle iroit là, il faudroit en défalquer tout ce que le capital rendra en intérêt après la vente des cotons que hâteront les consommations des manufactures de cotonnades etablies à Anvers et aux environs (cette opération seroit donc plus avantageuse qu'un placement sans intérets pendant 5 ans). Il ne faut plus songer à la possibilité de spéculations pour réaliser au pair; ainsi tout bien examiné celle-ci me paroit être la seule qu'on puisse encore tenter. . . .

KRUTHOFFER

Paris le 11. Décembre 1791

XXVII MERCY-ARGENTEAU TO KRUTHOFFER

. . . . Relativement a ce que vous mande M^r^ Bethmann vous pouvez lui repondre qu'il n'ÿ a rien a faire avec M^r^ de Gamarache il s'en est expliqué nettement en disant qu'il trouvoit a acheter icÿ des assignats tous qu il en vouloit a 25 p. c. de Perte et qu'aucun pret sans interet ne lui procureroit un pareil avantage, j'aurois été charmé d associer M^r^ Bethmann en cette affaire si elle avoit eu lieu. Il ne nous reste donc que les cottons de Smirne, ou bien ne seroit il pas possible d'acheter un domaine National autre qu'un bien du clergé, nous en ferions l'acquisition en commun entre M^r^ Thugut et moi en ÿ employant chacun 200/m livres, mais il s'agiroit 1° de trouver un domaine de la couronne 2° qu'il fut a portée c est a dire dans une province rapprochée de Paris 3° qu'il consistat en quelques Bonnes fermes, ou Paturages en Normandie, 4 qu'il fut d une deffaite facile car vous sentez bien que nous ne le garderions que jusqu'au moment ou il seroit possible de le revendre pour l'argent comptant—il n ÿ a que mon amie qui par ses gens d'affaires puisse vous guider en cela. . . .

Le 16 X^bre^ 1791

XXVIII KRUTHOFFER TO MERCY-ARGENTEAU

La baisse rapide des assignats ayant fait hausser subitement les sucres M. Bethman a profité de l'occasion pour placer ceux de Votre Ex^ce^ à 100# le quintal payable un tiers comptant et les deux autres tiers en trois mois avec l'option de l'escompte. Cette vente est fort bonne d'autant plus que les dernieres lettres de St. Domingue sont plus rassurantes. Le produit de cette vente va augmenter le capital que nous avons en assignats, et j'en cherche partout un emploi utile, sans avoir le bonheur d'y réussir.[25] je n'ai

[25] This is the second letter of Dec. 17. In a letter of Dec. 21 Kruthoffer says that

pas encore de réponse de Marseille; elle ne peut tarder, et je serai très-empressé d'en faire part à Votre Excellence. . . .

KRUTHOFFER

Paris 17. X^bre 1791

XXIX KRUTHOFFER TO MERCY-ARGENTEAU

Je quitte à l'instant l'Ami de Votre Ex^ce Nous avons conféré sur les meilleur moyen d'employer les assignats. Il a rejetté le placement sur hypothêque, et l'acquisition des biens nationaux parcequ'il faudroit chercher trop loin de la Capitale ceux qui pourroient convenir. Le meilleur emploi pour le moment lui paroit être celui qui se trouve indiqué dans la lettre ci-jointe [26]: Si Votre Ex^ce l'approuve, alors Elle fera partir cette lettre pour sa destination; Si non, Elle voudra bien me la renvoyer. Son Ami a compté sur ce qu'il y a actuellement en assignats et sur la prochaine rentrée du semestre echu des rentes viageres; Si la somme n s'éleve pas à celle qu'il a fixée, il y suppléera de sa Caisse. Cette opération lui paroit la seule utile et convenable aux circonstances; la perte du change se trouvera couverte par le bénéfice, et il espère arriver au pair. . . .

KRUTHOFFER

Paris le 13 Janvier 1792

XXX MERCY-ARGENTEAU TO KRUTHOFFER

. . . . Mon amie voudroit que je vous chargeasse de lui remettre tous mes assignats pour les convertir en lettres de change sur l'étranger c'est a dire de perdre a ce revirement 50 o/o je vous avoue que je ne puis resoudre a un

Laborde had asked him to warn Mercy not to sell the sugar until he gave the word. If Bethman had waited a few days he would have realized 125 and upwards per quintal. Laborde hopes that the profits of sale of sugar at Ostende would make up for losses at Bordeaux. Bethman afterwards expressed regret for being so timid. According to a letter of Dec. 27 (M.-A. to K.) Count Mercy did not feel offended by Bethman's miscalculation. It was a case of chances under circumstances the turn of which one cannot predict—"l'essentiel est de nous debarrasser de nos assignats soit par la voÿe du commerce soit par tout autres moÿens comme celui d'achetter un domaine Roÿal sans batiments autre que ceux d'utilité pour la culture". In regard to this in a letter of Jan. 1 Kruthoffer proposed a purchase in Angoumois, an estate which belonged to the apanage of the Count of Artois. In a reply of Jan. 6 Mercy says this estate is too remote and refers to advertisements of a sale of houses on "l'emplacement des quinze vingts" for resale when coin again appears. Kruthoffer replies on Jan. 12 that "Les maisons bâties sur l'ancien emplacement des Quinze Vingts sont mal distribuées; pour en tirer parti il faut les louer à des femmes de mauvaise vie, circonstance qui cause souvent des embarras et des dégâts dans l'interieur des chambres." As late as July, 1792, Count Mercy returns to the question of an investment in houses. The aim is to utilize the assignats on hand, not for permanent investment, because these houses would be heavily burdened with taxes. On July 22 he becomes more specific. The house in question should be in a mercantile quarter, "de manière a favoriser des loÿers, Bourgeois et marchands".

[26] This letter was addressed, under date of January 13, to Hope and Company of Amsterdam and called for the expenditure of 500,000 livres, or at least the major part, in sugar, and the remainder in coffee. Laborde did not give Mercy-Argenteau's name, but explained that the holder of the credit, "son plus intime ami" should be designated by the letter "M". A postscript, added after some reluctance was expressed by Count Mercy because of the exorbitant price of sugar and coffee at Ostende, reduced the amount to 300,000 livres. A little later at Count Mercy's request, Hope was told who "M" was.

si enorme sacrifice et que je crois qu'il seroit moindre en prenant quelle autre mesure que ce soit, fut ce d'acheter des effets des Bronzes, Pendules etoffes de soÿe Bijoux diamants & sans doute il seroit imprudent de mettre une somme considerable en pareils achats qui demandent une grande intelligence et connaissance des vraÿes valeurs, mais une centaine de mille livres pourroit etre hasardés dans cette speculation, 100 autres mille emploÿes a Bordeaux, mieux que tout cela encore, un achat de Negres et d'utensilles pour mon habitation, enfin on garderoit une certaine quantité d'assignats que M. Bethmann regarde comme de l or en barre [27] mais recommandez bien a Dunckel de se garder des faux assignats et de bien etudier la maniere de les reconnoitre. . . .

Le 2 fev

XXXI KRUTHOFFER TO MERCY-ARGENTEAU

Je viens de remettre la lettre que Votre Ex^ce^ a adressée à son ami. . . . L'ami a pour principe de ne point calculer de petits sacrifices quand il s'agit de ne rien laisser au hazard et de se procurer le repos d'esprit nécessaire dans les grands événemens. . . .[28] Quant à l'emploi des assignats l'ami m'a chargé de faire revenir les fonds de Bordeaux en papier sur Amsterdam ou Londres: il se flatte de pouvoir renouer la spéculation sur la premiere de ces

[27] This receives its point from a remark in Kruthoffer's letter of Jan. 1, 1792, "beaucoup de capitalistes (M. Bethman est du nombre) n'ont nulle inquiétude sur la valeur de ce papier, qui est une dette nationale, hypothequée sur les biens domaniaux", etc.

[28] This letter was sent before Mercy's letter of Feb. 2 was received. Mercy's remarks about losses of exchange caused Laborde to hesitate, as Kruthoffer reports in a reply of Feb. 7, but he finally sent an order to employ 350/m, on the understanding that if Mercy did not approve he would assume the investment personally. Kruthoffer represents Laborde as disapproving the plan for investments in various types of merchandize, as developed in the letter of Feb. 2, because prices in France have risen as the assignats have depreciated and because it would be very difficult to place such articles abroad without loss, including expenses of boxing and forwarding. Kruthoffer added, "En un mot son opinion est que vû les prix forcés de toutes choses en france, on n'y peut plus opérer sur rien, et que des spéculations dans l'étranger peuvent seules promettre des dédommagements de la perte du change qu'on eprouve en faisant par cette voie sortir ses fonds du Royaume. Je ne dois pas laisser ignorer à Votre Ex^ce^ que son Ami m'a paru fort peiné de se trouver arrêté tout court. Pour me prouver la justesse de son coup d'oeil dans les grandes affaires de ce genre, il m'a rappellé l'opération de Londres qui en ce moment rendroit Cent pour Cent de bénéfice si l'on vouloit faire un revirement". In a letter to Kruthoffer of Feb. 10 Mercy says "puisque mon amie persiste dans son idee sur Amsterdam, j'ÿ adhere, et emploierai volontier les 350/m liv.". Kruthoffer reports on March 24 that the remittances to Amsterdam suffered from a very unfavorable exchange situation, but if the proper moment were chosen for sale of the products a part of the loss might be retrieved. According to a letter from Hope and Co. of March 6 exchange, normal at 56, was then 26 1/2 to 26, a fall of 12 to 14 o/o from the date at which the remittance was forwarded. From the tables in appendix IV of *Recherches sur les relations économiques entre la France et la Hollande pendant la Révolution française* (Paris, 1923), by J. B. Manger, jr., this was the most unfavorable moment of the whole year. It affected primarily that part of the remittance which was in bills on Paris. Hope asked Mercy for instructions whether to cash the Paris bills. After hearing from Mercy, Hope realized on these bills at 29. In a later letter when exchange had risen further Mercy expressed his regret that the bills had been negotiated so promptly.

places, parceque les contestations élevées à Cologne entre l'Electeur et le Magistrat de la Ville au sujet des droits de péages à percevoir sur les marchandises venant d'Hollande, en arrêtent en ce moment la circulation en Allemagne et les travaux des raffinneries hollandaises. Si l'opération est faisable il espère obtenir un dedommagement quelconque de la perte du change. . . .

KRUTHOFFER

Paris le 6. fevrier 1792

XXXII LABORDE TO MERCY-ARGENTEAU

(undated, reply of Feb. 17).

. . . . 3°. j'ai ecrit Lundi a amst^m à mes amis pour les engager a acheter une petite partie de sucre de 350 mille Livs pour un de mes amis et je leur recommande cette emplete avec bien plus d interet que je ne l aurois fait pour moi meme. 4°. j'avois dit d'écrire a Bord^x de remetre du papier sur Londres et amsterdam qui auroit doné un benefice de 6 o/o, mais on n a pû ecrire assez tot et on a remis sur Paris a 3 1/2 environ 90 mille L: J espere que le reste sera remis sur l etranger, tout cela avec la rente viagère servira à payer L emplete. Si on la fait: Ve peut etre tranquille sur le soin que je donerai à ce qui l'interesse. . . .

XXXIII LABORDE TO MERCY-ARGENTEAU

Jai recu Monsieur, le Comte les deux dernières lettres dont VE. m a honnoré; je me suis ocupé de l arrangement des fonds de VE et on a du lui remetre copie de ma lettre a M^rs Hope & C^e ainsi que la Note des fonds que je leur ai adressé pour le Payemen des sucres achetés et qui ne sufiront pas pour remplir près de 400/m. qu'on pourra reunir sous peu de jours par les environ 100/m. de rentes viageres qu'on touchera des quelles je prendrai du papier sur amsterdam ou Londres pour le remetre a M^rs Hope et C^e.[29] Je joindrai 54/m que j'ai chez moi a M le Baron de thugut pour que l employe de toute la somme soit faite en sucre; je n ai pas compris du caffé parce qu'il s en faut bien que mon opinion sur cette denrée soit aussi favorable que sur le sucre. par cet arrangement J espere qu'avec du tems VE. sera dedomagée du moins en partie de la perte enorme qu elle eprouve à faire sortir ses fonds de ce misérable royaume. . . .

Le 1 Mars.

XXXIV MERCY-ARGENTEAU TO KRUTHOFFER

. . . . ditte a mon amie . . . que relativement au billet qui se trouvoit joint a votre lettre et qui a trait a l'affaire d'Amsterdam, *je suis resolû a suivre la même marche qu'il tiendra* j attendrai le *mois* de 7^bre ou 8^bre *s'il*

[29] A few days later in reporting another remittance to Hope and Co. at a more favorable rate, Laborde expresses the hope that the speculation in sugar may be successful, adding: "Mais rien ne pourra aprocher des 600 m. placés à Londres sur le 3 o/o a 72 1/2 et le change a 27, de manière que si VE vouloit faire revenir cet objet en france il produira 1200 m. c est à dire le double ce qui n a point d example dans ce genre de transactions. . . ." In a letter of March 15 to Kruthoffer, Mercy notes the loss of almost one hundred per cent on remittances to London or Amsterdam, and does not see how such losses can be covered, even in part, but defers to the superior knowledge of Laborde.

prendra parti plus acceleré ou plus retardé j'en userai de même qu'enfin je le prie de faire faire pour moi ce qui sera fait pour lui, voila ma systeme *provisoire si* des evenements devoient y necessiter des changements j'en avertirois sur le champ. . . .[30]

Le 12 avril

[30] In a letter to Hope on July 12 Mercy seems to be awaiting anxiously the occasion to sell his sugar. He refers to losses of interest on his invested funds, probably meaning his *rentes viagères*. There is a long series of letters from Hope to Mercy, the last of which was of June 2, 1794 (Mercy died in London on August 25). These explain the reason why the price of sugar remained low, mainly the interruption of trade by the war. For a time in the winter of 1792-1793 Hope feared that the French might reach Rotterdam where the sugar was stored. The defeat of Dumouriez at Neerwinden in March, 1793, relieved this anxiety and Mercy was dead before actual invasion took place.

It may be worth adding that at the time of his death Count Mercy possessed in English three per cents, according to a report of Harman Hoare, £134,990 (Pimodan, p. 430, n. 1).

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

BOOKS OF ANCIENT AND MEDIEVAL HISTORY

A Documentary History of Primitivism and Related Ideas. General Editors, ARTHUR O. LOVEJOY, GILBERT CHINARD, GEORGE BOAS, RONALD S. CRANE. Volume I, *Primitivism and Related Ideas in Antiquity*. By ARTHUR O. LOVEJOY, GEORGE BOAS. With Supplementary Essays by W. F. ALBRIGHT and P. E. DUMONT. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press. 1935. Pp. xv, 482. $5.00.)

IN this interesting and valuable first volume, Professors Lovejoy and Boas have gathered a large proportion of the texts, Greek and Latin, which more or less directly illustrate ancient beliefs in progress, decadence, or in cyclical change. They have provided these texts with translations and with fairly elaborate interspersed commentary; separate chapters have been awarded to Plato, Aristotle, Lucretius, and Cicero, "chiefly because of their special importance as individual influences", and also to Cynic and Stoic primitivism; Professor W. F. Albright has contributed an essay on "Primitivism in Ancient Western Asia", and Professor P. E. Dumont writes on "Primitivism in Indian Literature".

The translations vary from excellent to tolerable; there are a number of small inaccuracies in them, but I have found none which can be said to impair their usefulness for the ordinary reader. The authors have unfortunately yielded to custom in adopting "Jowett's classic version of Plato, with some emendations"; Jowett's version, admirable in style, needs too many emendations to make it a safe guide. And, again unfortunately, some of these emendations prove to be errors which Jowett did not commit; for example, in the translation (p. 157) of *Statesman,* 273 c-d, the Christian notion of "God, who made the world", is substituted for Jowett's correct "God, the orderer of all". The translation of *Critias,* 109 c (p. 160), affords another such instance; Jowett renders "governed us like pilots from the stern of a vessel, which is an easy way of guiding animals, by the rudder of persuasion, taking hold of our souls according to their own pleasure"; this has been perverted into "taking hold of our souls through pleasure, which is the easiest way to direct the movements of animals".

Far more important, to the student of the history of ideas and beliefs, is the genuine achievement of the authors in the analysis, subtle and exhaustive, of the concepts which are logically connected with "primitivism". Under 'chronological' primitivism fall the Theory of a Fall without Subsequent Decline, the Theory of Progressive Degeneration, the Theory of Decline and

Future Restoration; these are 'bilateral finitist theories'. The Theory of World-Cycles and the Theory of Endless Undulation are 'infinitist theories'. 'Cultural' primitivism is defined as "the discontent of the civilized with civilization, or with some conspicuous and characteristic feature of it" (p. 7); the men of the Golden Age were soft primitives, and the 'noble savages', the Scythians and Germans, were hard primitives. The Cynics and the Stoics were supporters of hard primitivism. The concept of nature is elaborately analyzed, both in the prolegomena (pp. 11 ff.) and in an appendix (pp. 447-456); and 'animalitarianism', the belief that the life of animals in general, or at least that of the higher animals, is superior to man's life, is wittily discussed.

The value of this work, both in the collection of relevant texts and the analysis of concepts pertaining to ancient estimates of the historic process, is real; but it would have been still more valuable if the authors had more often escaped from the tendency to substitute logical judgment for historical judgment, and if they had paid closer attention to the power and influence of Greek religious beliefs. For example, the Age of Heroes in Homer is dismissed with one citation, *Il.* I, 260-268, and with the remark that there is "already in Homer the recall of a past which is better than the present", which "seems to refer to what in Hesiod becomes the Age of Heroes" (p. 23). But the poems of Homer are throughout based upon the belief that the kings of the Heroic Age were all descended from some god or goddess; their personal power was a token of their divine descent; and the children of the great gods were mightier than the children of the lesser gods; the rule was stated by Achilles when he killed Asteropaeus—"By as much as Zeus is mightier than seaward-murmuring rivers, so is the offspring of Zeus made mightier than the offspring of a river" (*Il.* XXI, 190, 191). This belief in the relative divinity of the heroes was an item in the Greek national religion, and had wide social, political, and literary consequences.

As for the substitution of logical for historical judgment, it would be improper to illustrate this at length; but there is a clear case of it in the treatment of Hesiod's legend of the Five Ages, and of his story of Prometheus. The story of the culture-hero is said to imply "a very different conception of the course of history" from that in the legend of the Golden Age; and the two types of myth are said to express "essentially incongruous ways of thinking about the past history of one's people" (p. 24). Prometheus is therefore relegated to chapter VII as anti-primitivistic. But if we replace the two myths in their original setting in Hesiod, we see at once that Hesiod introduced them by vv. 27-41 of the *Works and Days*, in which he shows the connection between his two fundamental doctrines of work and justice (see Paul Mazon's edition, p. 83). Work is man's destiny, established for him by Zeus, and the story of Prometheus shows that none can escape from the laws of Zeus, just as the story of the Golden Age proves the necessity of work

for men who live in the Iron Age. Furthermore, though there is of course an outward logical incongruity between the improvement of man's condition by Prometheus and the decline since the Golden Age, the Greeks themselves regarded the intervention of culture-heroes as a material compensation for spiritual decline.

The University of Cincinnati. R. K. Hack.

La doctrine de la guerre juste de Saint Augustin à nos jours d'après les théologiens et les canonistes catholiques. Par Robert Regout, S.J., docteur en droit de l'Université de Leyde. Préface du R. P. Y. de la Brière. (Paris: A. Pedone. 1935. Pp. 342. 50 fr.)

In this scholarly book M. Regout is anxious to prove the continuity of the Catholic doctrine of just war from St. Augustine to the present and to refute the contention of M. Vanderpol (*La doctrine scolastique du droit de guerre,* Paris, 1919) that war, according to the medieval doctrine, is only just if undertaken to punish wrongdoing. Regout insists that Catholic doctrine has always recognized, as just, war to prevent or remedy injustice if no other method is available and the hardship of war is not disproportionate to the injustice, even though the state causing the injustice was acting under "invincible ignorance", and so was not guilty of a "fault" deserving punishment. He, however, exculpates M. Vanderpol, to whose erudition he pays tribute, to some extent, by pointing out that under the Catholic doctrine "offensive war" or war in the full sense is permissible only for punishment. War to defend or to restore rights must be limited to the acts necessary to accomplish those results. Furthermore, he admits that medieval writers used the word "vindicate" in a loose sense covering both reparation and punishment, and often did not visualize the possibility of objective without subjective wrong, that is, of injustice without culpability.

The writer has displayed great erudition in gleaning the passages from medieval authors bearing on the doctrine and great discrimination in explaining the meaning of these passages from the context and the general drift of their thought. The detailed exposition of the views of these medieval writers provides an invaluable basis for the history of international law.

In the reviewer's opinion, however, the author's conclusions suffer from too faithful following of the scholastic technique. M. Regout concludes that for fifteen hundred years there has been a single Catholic doctrine of just war, and that this doctrine "can provide the directing principle and clear ideas for the juridical organization of international society today" (p. 17). It is true the author recognizes that the application of these principles must vary from epoch to epoch with new conditions. The application, for example, of the principle that war can only be undertaken when all other means of preventing, repairing, or punishing injustice are unavailable depends upon the degree of development of juridical organization. So also

the application of the principle that war can only be resorted to when its hardships are not disproportionate to the injustice committed depends upon the methods of making war (p. 22). When we consider that the methods of pacific settlement available today are much more comprehensive than those available in the Middle Ages, and that the destructiveness of war is much more serious now than then, it is clear that these qualifications would greatly reduce the occasions when war could be legitimately resorted to at the present time (pp. 313-314). In the reviewer's opinion, however, the change in conditions has been so considerable that it modifies not merely the application of the principle, but the principle itself.

The central idea of the medieval theory, so far as it had a central idea, is that war is a means to justice. The question of who began the war is unimportant. Thus the distinction between defensive and offensive war is "morally neutral". A "defensive war" (to be distinguished from a war in defense of rights) may be unjust, and an "offensive war" may be just. Justice is, then, a value greater than peace (in the sense of no war—it is to be observed that St. Augustine used peace in a sense almost equivalent to a state of justice).

Regout tries to find this central principle in the League of Nations Covenant. "A war", he writes, "legitimately begun, in virtue of the Covenant of the League of Nations against a state refusing to submit to a juridical sentence ought to be called offensive and resistance to this war ought to be called defensive, although in such case it is a just war of police and an unjust war of resistance" (pp. 309-310). M. Regout, it is to be feared, knows more about the medieval writers than he does about the Covenant. The latter gives no authority to states individually or collectively to make war against a state merely because it has refused to submit to a juridical sentence. The sanctions are applicable only against a state which has "resorted to war" in violation of its Covenants. The only just war under the Covenant (at least until the period of pacific procedure has expired) is against a state which has resorted to war. Thus the only "just war" is a war of individual or collective defense against a state which has initiated war. This change from a system which contemplates war as an instrument of justice to a system which outlaws war except as defense against a state which has begun war, is so radical that it seems rather an abandonment than merely a new application of the medieval doctrine. It is also to be recalled that historically this new idea grew, not from the medieval doctrine but from a system of international law, which had aimed, not at determining the just side in a war but at limiting the destructiveness of military activity and preventing war from spreading by rules of war and neutrality; its central theme was not *jus ad bellum*, as in the Middle Ages, but *jus in bello*.

It also appears to the reviewer that the scholastic attitude which has led M. Regout to minimize the differences between the medieval and the modern

theory of just war, has also led him to minimize the historical differences which the Catholic theory underwent during its heyday. While he does give some attention to the differing circumstances surrounding the writers, widely separated in time, which he treats, the historical mind would perhaps insist that the ideological consequences of these differences should receive more emphasis. The successive Catholic writers were together in a desire to limit occasions for war, and to perpetuate words and phrases in a steady tradition, but each gave these words new meanings and gave elements of the doctrine new emphasis to fit the circumstances of the time in which he wrote.

Subtle as are the intellectual distinctions made by these writers, the reader is impressed by the paucity of discussion, whether among the theologians or canonists, of the application of these distinctions in actual cases. The insistence, characteristic of modern science, upon judging the value of theory by its practical applicability, is lacking. Distinctions that fall into neat categories and traditional verbiage are deemed adequate without detailed consideration of whether they would serve to decide which party is just in any actual war. Regout notes this lack of "evident criteria" (p. 303), but in his own exposition of the applicability of the doctrine today, he does little to remedy it. "To determine the legality of a defensive war", he writes, "one can demand the traditional conditions: that the attack is unjust, that war is the only means of stopping the injustice, and that war and the wrongs causing it are proportionate" (p. 310). Such subjective criteria clearly need development before they can be used.

M. Regout, however, did not set himself the task of presenting usable criteria of aggression. For his exposition of the ideas of Catholic writers on this fundamental subject of international relations, and for his appreciation of the importance of continuing research for ideas on the subject, the reviewer has nothing but admiration.

The University of Chicago. QUINCY WRIGHT.

Histoire du Moyen Age. Tome I, *Les destinées de l'Empire en Occident de 395 à 888.* Fascicule IV. Par FERDINAND LOT, membre de l'Institut, professeur à la Sorbonne, CHRISTIAN PFISTER, membre de l'Institut, recteur de l'Académie de Strasbourg, FRANÇOIS L. GANSHOF, chargé de cours à l'Université de Gand. [Histoire générale, publiée sous la direction de Gustave Glotz.] (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France. 1935. Pp. 473-831. 30 fr.)

OF ten volumes allotted to the Middle Ages, in the "histoire générale" of which the late M. Glotz was sponsor, three (I, II, VIII) are now ready, Tome I being complete with the appearance of the publication here under review. This fascicle centers broadly upon the history of the Occident in the ninth century. Its authors are six in number; but two, MM. Lot and Ganshof, have contributed approximately three fourths of the contents. The political

and institutional history of the Carolingian Empire and its several offshoots, also the development of the Scandinavian world to the end of the ninth century, are presented by M. Ganshof. Abbé Arquillière, of the Catholic Institute of Paris, deals with the Church in the Carolingian epoch. The chapter on Carolingian civilization is of composite authorship, and has been divided into three sections devoted respectively to economic, intellectual, and artistic life: the first section is by Professor Vercauteren, of the Colonial University of Antwerp; the second, by the Reverend Father Théry, of the Catholic Institute of Paris, and M. Lot; the third, by Professor Aubert, of the École des Chartes. M. Lot also treats of the antecedents of feudalism, the history of the British Isles from the fifth century to the tenth, and the history of Spain in the period 711-1037. A supplementary bibliography brings the documentation of the entire first volume up to the early months of 1935. The index, which likewise covers the volume as a whole, appears to be exhaustive for proper names.

Despite the obvious difficulty of establishing satisfactory boundaries between certain of the topics, there is remarkably little overlapping in their treatment, scarcely more than clarity and the integrity of the topics demand. Almost every chapter is an excellent specimen of rigorously critical (yet not hypercritical) synthetic scholarship, and the exposition may be described as admirably succinct and lucid. The documentation, uncommonly copious for an "histoire générale", includes references not only to the essential source materials and to the standard secondary works but also to the monographic and other specialized literature. Footnotes supply in terse form a wealth of information on points of detail; and in debatable matters they usually signalize, often with brief critical appreciation, the positions of the leading writers. In view of the considerable amount of scholarly investigation which the last quarter century has seen in the field covered by the fascicle, it was high time to incorporate the net conclusions in a fresh synthesis. The skill and acumen with which the authors have performed this difficult task, dispose the reviewer to think that their work supplies a new general *terminus a quo* for study of the several subjects they have reintegrated.

Errors that have been noted are neither numerous nor serious: it is probably due to a mere slip of the pen that the *Origo gentis Langobardorum* is ascribed to Paul the Deacon (p. 621), and that the formerly Danish province of Schonen, or Scania, is referred to as an island (p. 507). The expression "chanoines réguliers de saint Chrodegang" (p. 574) was perhaps not intended to imply that these canons were regulars in the strict sense. Of the emporium Chappes, and of the problem connected with the merchants called *cappi*, mention might well have been made, at least in a note. Also, a somewhat fuller documentation would seem desirable on the subject of the *missi dominici* (p. 552) and on the Carolingian army (p. 558).

The University of Chicago. EINAR JORANSON.

The Constitutional History of the Cinque Ports. By K. M. E. Murray, Sometime R. H. Research Student, Somerville College, Oxford. [Publications of the University of Manchester, No. CCXXXV.] (Manchester: University Press. 1935. Pp. xvi, 282. 12*s.* 6*d.*)

The "glorious rise of the famous galaxy of towns" known as the Cinque Ports has been held largely responsible for England's sea power. Their description of themselves as the "Gates that open and shutt to the perill or safety of this Kingdome" suggests the *Libelle of Englyshe Polycye:* "And chefely kepe sharply the narowe see Betwene Dover and Caleise . . .". Their privileges have been considered important gains in the struggle for constitutional liberties. That this double tradition is "mainly founded on fiction" is Miss Murray's contention. Her conclusions are based on a singularly wide range of manuscript collections in the British Museum and other libraries; in the Record Office; and, often unsorted and uncatalogued, in the archives of the Ports. The nature of the material explains why, since the attempt of Burrows in 1888, there has been no comprehensive study of the Liberty. We are therefore grateful to Miss Murray for a vigorous, scholarly, and valuable contribution to the constitutional history of this confederation of Kent and Sussex towns (one in Essex): five Head Ports, Hastings, Romney, Hythe, Dover, and Sandwich; two Ancient Towns, Winchelsea and Rye; and thirty Members, corporate and noncorporate.

In the controversy about origins, Miss Murray infers from charters to individual Ports and other evidence that an informal organization existed under Edward the Confessor; under pressure of naval needs and the menace of the piracy of the Portsmen, the organization was given official recognition in 1260 and 1278 by the issue of charters to the Ports as a group. The annual service of fifty-seven ships for fifteen days was easily met by fisherfolk, living in regions of strategic importance, who had been long accustomed to sail together every autumn for North Sea fishing. The liberties of the Portsmen included judicial and financial immunities, frequent in municipal charters, and certain unique privileges, control of the Yarmouth herring fair, 'honours at court' (carrying the royal canopy at a coronation), and the right of summons to Parliament as barons.

The warden is shown to have been a more powerful royal official than an ordinary sheriff, chiefly because he was also constable of Dover castle and admiral. Inevitably, his chancery and admiralty courts at Dover superseded Shepway, the great court of the Liberty. The history of the Brodhull, the assembly of Head Ports for maintaining their liberties and regulating the Yarmouth fisheries, and of the Guestling, eventually the assembly of corporate members, proves that the organization of the confederation was not perfected till its usefulness was past. The rapid decline of the Ports, after their brief naval glory in the thirteenth century, was due to changes in the size of ships and length of service, and also to the silting up of harbors.

Miss Murray is weakest in legal discussion. Her Latin is sometimes faulty (p. 69); her phraseology not always accurate, 'distressed' for 'distrained' (p. 148), 'de homine replegiante' for 'replegiando' (p. 111). It is not true that mainprise in homicide cases is 'significant' (p. 16). More serious is the lack of a precise interpretation of the immunities of the Portsmen from jury duty and pleading in 'foreign' courts. How did it happen that Faversham hundred juries appeared at the eyre of 1313 and sessions of the peace of 1316? Except for admiralty jurisdiction, the evidence is conflicting; but until the charter of 1465 the immunities were mainly for civil actions. For criminal pleas, the king's bench needs investigation, also the courts of the individual Ports under separate commissions of the peace.

Miss Murray emphasizes the need for more knowledge of the economic history of the Ports and of their long fight with Yarmouth. She argues justly that mere fishermen and pirates ought not to be compared with the Hanseatic League. But it is well to remember that in medieval England fish were a vital necessity: 'Saint Patrike for Ireland, Saint George for England, and the red Herring for Yarmouth!'

Mount Holyoke College. B. H. PUTNAM.

The Borough of Bury St. Edmund's: a Study in the Government and Development of a Monastic Town. By M. D. LOBEL. (New York: Oxford University Press. 1935. Pp. xi, 205. $5.00.)

WITH regard to the early history of towns in England, the student has a choice of two conflicting views. One is that the borough was from the very beginning a town in our sense of the word. The other is that borough and town should not always be used as synonymous terms: the urban character of the borough, together with its organization as a privileged municipality, was a later development, mainly the product of the years after 1066. The former opinion is that held by most British historians; the latter is the one recently advanced by the present reviewer (*Borough and Town*, 1933). Miss Lobel, having chosen to follow traditional authority, should not be surprised at unsympathetic treatment from the opposing camp.

Miss Lobel's subtitle gives a hint of what, in the opinion of the said reviewer, is the fatal defect of her little book. She has attempted to analyze the constitution of a medieval town as one definite whole, with only a preface and a postscript on its development. Of her 170 pages of text, 102 (the second chapter) thus deal with the government of Bury St. Edmund's "from the twelfth to the sixteenth century"—as long a time as has now elapsed since the reign of Henry VIII. "To avoid unnecessary repetition", says Miss Lobel, she has "avoided" a chronological treatment of the subject. With it, one may feel, she has abandoned a prime requisite of historical research; for no amount of interesting detail concerning individual officials and administrative organs, when drawn from scattered documents of four centuries, can

be fitted into a convincing picture. And Miss Lobel fails to provide even a critical introduction to her principal sources.

Under such circumstances it is not surprising that her first and third chapters lack clear objectives. How can we understand the struggle for municipal independence at Bury St. Edmund's until we understand the contemporary evolution of its municipal institutions? And how can the origin of the borough be explained without first explaining what the borough was? Are we dealing with a place name, a piece of land, a fortification, or a group of men? The reader is left bewildered by a plethora of half-suggested origins: *e. g.*, a royal vill, a jurisdictional immunity, a walled *burh*, an administrative center with mint and market, an urban settlement, and a privileged community of burgesses.

The confusion is the more regrettable because it prevents any lucid explanation of the town's physical growth. The prominent features of that expansion may be detected even from the materials cited by Miss Lobel: (1) a great abbey with manorial estates; (2) an Anglo-Saxon *burh* of the primitive type;[1] (3) a remarkable influx of settlers, principally mercantile, under the first Norman abbot; and (4) the consequent delimitation of a borough in the later sense of the word—a community of free inhabitants from which the modern town is sprung. But Miss Lobel can imagine (p. 6) an eleventh-century Bury St. Edmund's including, like that of today, 2900 acres!

Cornell University. CARL STEPHENSON.

BOOKS OF MODERN HISTORY

L'hégémonie européenne: période italo-espagnole. Par HERMAN VANDER LINDEN, professeur à l'Université de Liège. [Histoire du monde publiée sous la direction de M. E. Cavaignac, X.] (Paris: E. de Boccard. 1936. Pp. xi, 470. 40 fr.)

THREE or four collaborate histories of the world are at present being published in France. The most important is entitled *Peuples et civilisations* and is put forth under the direction of Louis Halphen and Philippe Sagnac. Another is that to which the present volume belongs, and the evidences of haste and carelessness in its composition are such as to make one suspect that the series are running a desperate race for priority on the book market.

Professor Vander Linden has made many valuable contributions to the history of his native land; he is also known to many readers on this side of

[1] In fairness to Miss Lobel, I must admit having overlooked the description of Bury St. Edmund's as a *burh* in pre-Domesday charters (*Borough and Town*, p. 76, n. 8). The slip, however, does not affect my argument that the borough liberties were probably of Norman origin—an argument to which, as to my whole central thesis, Miss Lobel makes no reference; *cf.* her notes on pp. 12, 15.

the Atlantic as the joint author with Professor Charles de Lannoy of an excellent volume on Portuguese and Spanish colonization. But in the work that lies before us, which covers the period from the opening of the Italian Wars to the Age of Louis XIV, he is certainly not seen at his best. One feels throughout that he has been pressed, not only for lack of time but also for lack of space. He has been obliged to condense, and he has been so hurried in the process that he has been wholly unable to do himself justice.

The best parts of the book are those which deal with the Netherlands and with Spain and her dependencies in the Old World and in the New; but even these are not free from blemish. Thus we read that ". . . le royaume de Naples a été donné par Alphonse V d'Aragon à son fils naturel Alphonse, surnommé le Magnanime . . ." (p. 23), whereas the facts are that Alphonso V of Aragon *was* himself Alphonso the Magnanimous, and left Naples, at his death, to his illegitimate son Ferrante. On page 260 we are told that "à partir de 1559, Philippe II dirigea le gouvernement du fond de l'Escurial"; but the first stone of that edifice was not laid till 1563. Venezuela (p. 152) is placed in the viceroyalty of New Castile instead of in that of New Spain, and the sentence that follows about captaincies general will not bear inspection. In the pages on France and Germany there are numerous minor inaccuracies and several startling omissions. But it is in his treatment of England that Professor Vander Linden is most grievously at fault. He makes Henry VIII marry Catherine of Aragon *before* instead of *after* his accession (p. 179); he calls him *"protector"* instead of *"Defensor Fidei" (ibid.)*. Wyatt's rebellion is placed in February, 1558 (p. 225); the defeat of the Spanish Armada in 1587 (p. 291), and the death of Elizabeth in 1604 (p. 296). Francis Bacon was born in 1561 and not in 1563 as Professor Vander Linden has it (p. 449, n.), and he was not educated at Oxford, but at Cambridge. Worst of all is the account of the period from 1649 to 1660, which is dismissed in three and one third pages, much of which is devoted to military and diplomatic affairs and to conquests beyond the seas. There is no clear distinction between the Commonwealth and the Protectorate, and the Instrument of Government is not even mentioned. There is no index, and the table of contents is so faulty as to be more of a hindrance than a help. Chapter VI of Book IV (pp. 392-400) does not appear there at all; chapter VII in the text (pp. 401-441) is labeled chapter VI in the table; a second chapter VII in the text (pp. 442-457) makes things come out square at the end.

Every now and then one finds a little nugget, which shows what Professor Vander Linden can do when he is not under pressure. Such is the footnote to page 112, pointing out that Philip the Handsome and Joanna the Mad were married at the little town of Lierre near Antwerp, and not, as most historians—following Zurita—have thought, at Lille. (The story of the wedding is amusing, and may be read in detail in Lorenzo de Padilla's *Crónica de Felipe I* in the *Documentos inéditos para la Historia de España*, VIII, 40-41, and more recently in L. Pfandl's *Johanna die Wahnsinnige*,

pp. 51-52.) But flashes of this kind are distressingly rare. The moral seems to be that world histories of the type to which this belongs are the most difficult of all things to write—indeed next to impossible unless the author be granted adequate time and at least a reasonable amount of space.

Harvard University. ROGER B. MERRIMAN.

A History of Science, Technology, and Philosophy in the 16th and 17th Centuries. By A. WOLF, Professor and Senator, University of London, with the co-operation of Dr. F. DANNEMANN, Professor in the University of Bonn, and Mr. A. ARMITAGE, of University College, London. [History of Science Library, edited by Professor A. Wolf.] (New York: Macmillan Company. 1935. Pp. xxvii, 692. $7.00.)

PROFESSOR Wolf's reputation as a Spinozistic scholar and as a teacher of the method of science in the University of London caused this volume to be anticipated by all those interested in the history of ideas. No more intriguing period could have been chosen. The sixteenth and seventeenth centuries are cluttered with great names but these centuries are also associated with movements of vital historical significance. The least one can say is that Professor Wolf failed to avail himself of an opportunity. He eschewed the rich background of the Renaissance and the Reformation in favor of elaborate technical detail (especially p. 150). He chose to quote at length from sources—not always inaccessible (p. 345), rather than to integrate the revolutions of Copernicus and Newton with the greatest period of geographical discovery and expansion. He preferred to give a labored account of mechanical processes (pp. 71 ff.) rather than to correlate economic and social development with technological improvement. In short, Professor Wolf has given us merely another history of science.

The book is divided into twenty-six chapters. The major emphasis is on the physical sciences which are distributed as follows: five chapters on astronomy, three on physics, and one each on mathematics, chemistry, geology, and meteorology. The discussion is fullest on astronomy but it is precisely in this field that the author is least convincing. Save for seven brief lines (p. 25) one is left ignorant of the meaning of the Copernican revolution and no cogent reasons are assigned for the spread of its doctrines. The influence of the discoveries of Copernicus on Bruno are briefly mentioned but nothing is said of the effect of a heliocentric theory on geographical science and subsequent discoveries. Newton's impact on the contemporary mind is not discussed (p. 161, see *per contra* Carl Becker's brief discussion, *The Declaration of Independence*, 1922, pp. 41 ff.) and one is just as mystified after having read it as before.

The introduction to the chapter on mathematics (pp. 188-189) is one of the best in the book, but the rest is little more than a catalogue. The treatment of psychology, meteorology, and chemistry, although somewhat better,

hardly approaches the ideal set forth in the preface (to furnish "a new intellectual orientation", p. xxvii). Those portions devoted to the natural and social sciences are the most lucid. The inclusion of technology is a wholesome innovation. Here again there is an excellent introduction (pp. 450-453) and one cannot but regret that it is so brief. One still wonders—and this is true in the chapters on scientific academies and scientific instruments—what bearing technology had on life and thought in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

The rigidity of a topical treatment mars the whole book and destroys what little attempt the author makes at correlation. He constantly refers to later chapters lest he should be caught treating Newton as an astronomer and a mathematician in the same division of the book. This is often carried to extremes. Hobbes, Descartes, Spinoza, Locke, and Leibnitz are first treated in a chapter on psychology and later as philosophers. It would have added immeasurably to the clarity of the discussion if they had been treated in a single chapter (see the discussion of Descartes, p. 567). The large result is that persons and events are torn from their context in order to serve a topical consistency. It was hoped, too, that Professor Wolf's extensive knowledge of the philosophy of this period would find its way into the volume.

The index leaves much to be desired and this reviewer cannot agree with the author that a bibliography was unnecessary. The difficulty of finding an exact citation for a specific statement could have been obviated by footnotes. The book is beautifully printed and there are 316 excellent illustrations.

Cambridge, Massachusetts. BERT JAMES LOEWENBERG.

Bibliography of Economics, 1751-1775. By HENRY HIGGS, C. B. [Prepared for the British Academy.] (Cambridge: University Press; New York: Macmillan Company. 1935. Pp. xxii, 742. $11.00.)

THIS is the first installment of what promises to be a monumental work, for it is proposed to continue the bibliography both forward and backward. The particular period, 1751-1775, seems to have been chosen because it "marks the dawn of economic science" (p. ix) and was one of great intellectual ferment. In this quarter century are to be found not merely the beginnings of the agricultural and the industrial revolutions which transformed so completely English economic and social life, but also a great number of brilliant writers who revolutionized thinking along many lines. This period witnessed in France the publication of Diderot and D'Alembert's great *Encyclopédie*, the rise of the school of Physiocrats, and the establishment of several economic journals, in Italy the endowment of the first chair of political economy, and in England the appearance of a whole galaxy of writers, from the learned Malachy Postlethwayt to Adam Smith. During this quarter cen-

tury the colonial empire of Great Britain was consolidated, the French were driven from India and Canada, and the American colonies had not yet been lost. Brilliant though the achievements were, they brought in their train troublesome problems—of agricultural and industrial readjustment, of pauperism and charity, of colonial administration, and of taxation and public debt. These give the key to the literature of the period.

The arrangement of the bibliography is both chronological and topical. In each year from 1751 to 1775 inclusive the publications are arranged under the following topics: general economics, agriculture (including the extractive industries), shipping, manufactures, commerce, colonies, finance, transport, social conditions, topography, and miscellaneous. The pressure of particularly exigent problems and the shift in public interest is well illustrated by the fluctuations in the number of items included under each of these heads from year to year. Thus, in 1751 finance contains the most entries, but in 1775 colonies is the topic of most absorbing interest and far outruns all the others. The economic history of Great Britain is epitomized in these bibliographical records.

The scope of the work is not altogether clear. The preface states that "it includes such works, known to exist . . . as are deemed . . . of sufficient economic interest to justify their inclusion". It is not confined to items appearing in Great Britain, but includes also some works published in France, Italy, and the American colonies. The list of the last group is extremely small, and one wonders if it might not profitably have been enlarged. The authorship of one of the most valuable works on colonial conditions—*American Husbandry*—published anonymously, is ascribed, wrongly it seems to the reviewer, to Arthur Young. It is doubtful if Young ever visited America, and there is strong probability that this study was the work of Dr. John Mitchell, an English physician and naturalist, who lived for some time in Virginia.

The bibliography has been edited by Mr. Henry Higgs, whose definitive study of *The Physiocrats* prepared him uniquely for codifying the literature of this period. He has placed all scholars in his debt by his careful and scholarly work.

The University of Illinois. E. L. Bogart.

Edward Pellew, Viscount Exmouth, Admiral of the Red. By C. Northcote Parkinson, Sometime Exhibitioner of Emmanuel College, Cambridge. (London: Methuen and Company. 1934. Pp. viii, 478. 15*s*.)

Aided by the family papers previously inaccessible, Mr. Parkinson has written a new life of this neglected figure. Lord Exmouth entered the navy in 1770, and was active in its service for over half a century. According to Mr. Parkinson, "Far more truly than Nelson, he was the ideal sea-officer of

his age." Pellew's first biographer, Edward Osler, a century ago described him as the young hero, struggling successfully against adversity and becoming both an admiral and a viscount.

Pellew's first real opportunity came when he joined Burgoyne's expedition to Canada. The author suggests that if the British had driven Arnold from Lake Champlain during the autumn of 1776, Burgoyne might have found his way southward the next year without Howe's assistance. Pellew personally was so successful that he was promoted upon his return to England. The next fifteen years he worked his way upward. He was especially active from the beginning of the French war in 1793, being mainly engaged in the Channel or in blockading the French coast. Just before Trafalgar he went to the East Indies, only to discover that as a result of a political intrigue the more important area there had been assigned to another. In the ensuing controversy he was unquestionably insubordinate but escaped punishment. He was next stationed in the Mediterranean, but with the advent of peace he was sent to negotiate with the Barbary States. Later still he successfully bombarded Algiers. Although he was in none of the greater battles of the period, his career, nevertheless, furnishes a cross section of the history of the British navy.

The author fails to show the relation of Pellew's work to the main military and diplomatic developments. He was active in putting down the naval mutinies of 1797, but there is no real attempt to explain or describe them; this is the period of Nelson and the Continental System, but both are practically ignored. We gain no adequate idea of the naval war as a whole, nor of naval administration, strategy, or tactics. This is due, perhaps, to the author's failure to utilize the manuscript resources of the Public Record Office and the Archives de la Marine. The book is unduly long. Many letters might have been briefly paraphrased, and the irrelevant portions of others omitted. We do gain, however, a clear idea of what was behind the life of a naval officer, of his dependence upon the patronage of important politicians or naval officers for promotion, and of the consequent jealousies among naval officers; we learn, moreover, how large a role prize money played in their lives. The capture of one vessel in the East Indies netted Pellew £26,000. Few navy men can have been more guilty of the prevailing nepotism. At one time Exmouth had a brother, two sons, and a son-in-law in the service!

The story is impartially told, and the work is very free from errors. Three statements, however, will certainly be questioned: "His [Pitt's] resignation of the premiership was not due to a Parliamentary defeat, but to the King's refusal to act dishonourably" (p. 303). "Of this [British colonial] population the most important section was the Nonconformist peasantry of New England. . . . The states which form it were then purely agricultural in character and Presbyterian for the most part in religion. Their population was engaged in raising food and in selling their surplus produce to

pirates" (p. 13). Indian fighting on the New England frontier was "best understood by certain of the Presbyterian Irish" (p. 17).

Indiana University. WILLIAM THOMAS MORGAN.

Condorcet and the Rise of Liberalism. By J. SALWYN SCHAPIRO. (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company. 1934. Pp. 311. $4.00.)

PROFESSOR Schapiro has written a clear and succinct account of Condorcet's life. But the book is much more than a biography. It is a study in the history of ideas. The facts of Condorcet's career were pretty well established in the works of Cahen and Allengry, though Mlle. Delsaux's *Condorcet journaliste* (1931) showed that new work was possible on special phases of his life. Professor Schapiro has not written a work of research, but rather a judicious appraisal of a man already well known. He makes no attempt to idealize the last of the *philosophes*. Condorcet appears as a kindly reformer not wholly free from the jealousies and inhibitions perhaps inevitably associated with the reforming temperament. In the field of intellectual history, Professor Schapiro has again done a work of synthesis rather than of research. He fits Condorcet into an admirably designed picture of the France of the great Encyclopedia. Chapter II on "The Social and Economic Transformation of France during the Eighteenth Century" is an excellent summing up of scholarly work of several generations. If one compares Professor Schapiro's attitude with the fundamental assumptions of a book like E. A. Lowell's *Eve of the French Revolution,* one can see clearly how the eighteenth century in France has grown for us more complex, more filled with lights and shades, more real, than it was after Taine and Aulard had finished with it. Professor Schapiro's concluding chapter on Liberalism is a temperate, almost chastened, reassertion of the liberal faith so uncompromisingly held by Condorcet and his peers.

Two critical remarks suggest themselves. One, of minor importance, concerns the statement that Condorcet was "in respect to England as the Promised Land . . . a heretic among the philosophes" (p. 123). But surely the second generation of *philosophes*—those maturing after 1750—were on the whole quite firmly anti-English? Rousseau thought the English free only every seven years, and Diderot and Holbach had a definite dislike for England. Condorcet was by no means unique in this respect. More serious is the possibility that Professor Schapiro, along with almost everyone else who has commented on Condorcet, and especially on his *Esquisse,* has exaggerated the extent to which he was a pure *idéologue*. "Although Condorcet", he writes, "had an idea of social progress, he did not have a clear idea of social evolution . . . . In discussing political, social, and economic changes Condorcet did not explain their relation to the new ideas that came with these changes" (pp. 264-265). Yet if one reads the fragments of more detailed history of certain of the epochs which accompany the *Esquisse,* one is

inclined to feel that Condorcet is groping for an explanation of social change not to be expressed as purely the work of Right Reason. The reviewer owes to one of his students, Mr. Oscar Handlin, the suggestion that Condorcet's insistence on the way the tools, trade, agriculture, institutions, religion of a given epoch set a limit to the work of ideas is at least a recognition of the role of environment in human evolution, if not a partial anticipation of the "challenge-and-response" formula of Mr. A. J. Toynbee. Condorcet certainly is aware of the necessity of explaining how one epoch develops out of another, and he certainly does not always explain that development in purely intellectual terms—witness the transition from the fifth epoch to the sixth.

Harvard University. CRANE BRINTON.

Les Massacres de Septembre. Par PIERRE CARON, conservateur des Archives modernes aux Archives nationales. (Paris: Maison du Livre Français. 1935. Pp. xlix, 559. 80 fr.)

THIS work is not a narrative history of the September Massacres, but, rather, a critical examination of the facts, traditions, and legends which lie at the basis of any possible account. Incidentally it offers an appraisement of what pass for the essential "sources", with critical comments also upon authors who have dealt with the subject. M. Caron tells us that this inquiry has been before his mind for the past fifteen years, while he has been engaged upon his professional tasks at the National Archives, especially the preparation of such inventories as that of the papers of the Comité de Sûreté générale, which has necessitated the opening of many *cartons* in different modern series, and so has brought to his attention documents hitherto unnoted.

The author's object has been "à essayer de savoir et de comprendre, puis de faire savoir et comprendre: rien de plus . . .". He imagines—not without some reason—that certain of his readers will be astonished to discover no suggestion of indignation over what took place. He explains that he is not a moralist, and adds: "Ce charnier ne sent d'ailleurs plus mauvais que tant d'autres. Et l'historien doit avoir l'odorat solide." If any reader, as he contemplates once more the "faits", finds that he has not this desirable "odorat solide", he may be reassured, for he will perceive accents of shock here and there even in the expressions of M. Caron himself. While in general M. Caron appears to think that the massacres had the aspect of orderly executions, he does remark that "dans l'ivresse de la tuerie, ont pu être commis d'inqualifiables excès", and does say of the movement as a whole, "Bref, le mécanisme classique du crime de foule".

It is in a special introduction, arranged in 101 numbered paragraphs, that the sources as well as the works of previous writers are examined, commonly one item per paragraph. We are constantly reminded that "eyewitnesses" have often testified to what they did not see and that they may have been in such a mental state as to see nothing exactly. For example, the Abbé Sicard

"n' a certainement eu ni l'envie de se faire voir ni les moyens de voir, et qu'en conséquence, selon toute apparence, telles ou telles de ses assertions les plus souvent reproduites ne font qu'enregistrer des on-dit, ou même des racontars absurdes". Moreover, Sicard's account was written three years later when he was filled, quite naturally, with the spirit of vengeance. Similarly, of Maton de la Varenne, M. Caron writes, "Maton a vu beaucoup, a vu trop pour un homme enfermé . . .". Of later writers, like Granier de Cassagnac and Mortimer-Ternaux, who must be consulted constantly because they saw and often copied documents which disappeared in the fires of the Commune of 1871, he is equally direct in his statements. His entire good faith, however, is illustrated by his treatment of Taine, for while criticizing Taine's point of view he credits him with having marked out the dominant traits of the revolutionary movement immediately following August 10, and particularly the murderous epidemic which had spread over certain sections of France even before the great outbreak in Paris. Accepting the soundness of Taine's idea, M. Caron has devoted his Part IV to a study of these analogous events in the departments from July to October, 1792. It should be added that the critical study of sources and writings summarized in the introduction is supplemented on almost every page of the whole work with abundant notes. This makes the volume indispensable to any serious study of the subject.

The bulk of the work is made up of Parts II and III, "Études des faits" and "Recherches des responsabilités". Students of the Revolution, whose minds have inevitably been occupied by many of these problems, will find themselves drawn on by deepening interest from one chapter to another of the whole 350 pages. The penetrating intelligence with which every imaginable line of inquiry has been pursued in order to complete the dossier of each alleged fact increases the reader's confidence as he proceeds. As illustrations one may select the treatment (pp. 15-26) of the question whether the prisons were abnormally full on September 2, or the role of the general council of the Commune (pp. 264-283) during the whole affair. Again, after examining all the evidence for incidents long regarded as established and incorporated as essential elements of the story, M. Caron often remarks that the basis for any conclusion is inadequate. For example, of the facts commonly adduced in support of the thesis of administrative organization of the massacres he says:

> Tout cela est peu consistant. Quelques-uns des faits allégués sont insignifiants. D'une documentation pauvre on tire des présomptions entachées d'exagération ou de déformation; de preuve, aucune.

When M. Caron does reach positive conclusions, they are cautiously discriminating. To illustrate, at the close of a long discussion of Danton's relation to the event he remarks that Danton's silence on September 2 and 3 indicates not "une protestation muette, mais un assentiment".

Assentiment de coeur? Pas précisément. Danton était certainement capable d'humanité, et nous n'avons pas de raison de penser qu'il aimât le sang pour le sang. Assentiment de tête? Plutôt. Comme il l'a laissé entendre à la Convention, la froide raison lui montrait l'inanité d'une tentative de lutte contre le flot populaire. . . .

From the general impression that the author declines to conclude when the basis of proved facts is inadequate some readers may wish to point out at least one exception. This comes in Part V, entitled "Les facteurs de l'acte", which states the judgments he has reached upon the principal phases of the event, and is section V on "La notion de justice populaire en 1792", and especially the idea that the people of Paris had taken over the right of "justice retenue", which had belonged to the monarchy. The theory is ingenious, but the reader may feel that once it has been suggested to the author by some of the evidence, the rest of the evidence is interpreted according to this particular hypothesis. The whole passage has too much the tone of an argument. With other judgments of the concluding part, especially the close relation between the dangers of war and invasion and the lynching mood, everyone will be in agreement. After all, as remarked at first, the unique value of this work is its critical sifting of evidence concerning perhaps the greatest tragedy of the Revolution.

The Library of Congress. HENRY E. BOURNE.

The Armies of the First French Republic and the Rise of the Marshals of Napoleon I. By the late Colonel RAMSAY WESTON PHIPPS, formerly of the Royal Artillery. Volume IV, *The Army of Italy, 1796 to 1797, Paris and the Army of the Interior, 1792 to 1797, and the Coup d'État of Fructidor, September, 1797.* (New York: Oxford University Press. 1935. Pp. xii, 325. $6.00.)

WHEN a note to the preface of the third volume of Colonel Ramsay Phipps's study of the armies of the First Republic announced that his son, Colonel Charles Phipps, who had prepared the third volume for publication after his father's death, had himself died before its appearance in print, one wondered whether his announced intention, to prepare another volume covering the history of the *Armée d'Italie* and the *coup d'état* of Fructidor from the material left by his father, would ever be carried through by his literary executors. The intimate understanding of the mind and purpose of an author necessary to complete his unfinished work is so rare that it is seldom that more than one person can be found adequate to the task.

It is therefore a pleasant surprise to witness the completion of the fourth volume by Elizabeth Sandars, the granddaughter of Colonel Ramsay Phipps. It is much to her credit that, under her handling, the story has lost none of its interest or excellence. So often, in the hands of a literary executor, an account may retain its nominal direction but undergo subtle changes that

deprive it of much of its original flavor and value. In this case, however, the original purpose of treating the history of the armies of the First Republic as the school for the future marshals of Napoleon has been kept clearly in mind. If anything, the reader is more aware of that intent in this volume than in the previous ones, although this may be attributed to the fact that so many of the future marshals participated in the campaign of 1796-1797. But much of the credit for the vivid impression the reader retains of Masséna, Augereau, Berthier, Brune, and others must be given to the skillful handling of the material.

The excellence of the study of the Italian campaign is not confined, however, to the characterizations of Napoleon's lieutenants. There is much good sense on the campaign itself, particularly in the insistence upon the peril of Bonaparte's operations and upon the degree to which his success depended upon the mistakes of his adversaries, a fact he himself understood but which has sometimes been forgotten by those who think of him only as the child of destiny.

The closing chapters upon Paris in war time, including fairly full accounts of the insurrection of Vendémiare and the *coup d'état* of Fructidor, are interesting and valuable, although perhaps a little less clearly written than the chapters on the Italian campaign.

It is unavoidable, in a study that has gone through so many hands before publication, that there should be a few uncertainties of touch. One cannot help remarking the number of occasions upon which "I presume" is substituted for certain knowledge of the whereabouts of a given individual. But, in view of all the circumstances, these hesitations are surprisingly few and perhaps wisely presented as such instead of glossed over. A few uncertainties of this sort do not detract seriously from a merit that is so marked that one looks forward expectantly to the account of the armies of 1798-1799 and the *coup d'état* of Brumaire that is tentatively promised.

Swarthmore College. TROYER S. ANDERSON.

Gladstone's Foreign Policy. By PAUL KNAPLUND, Professor of History in the University of Wisconsin. (New York: Harper and Brothers. 1935. Pp. xviii, 303. $2.50.)

THIS is an excellent analysis and a warm defense of Gladstone's foreign policy. It was that of "the good neighbor", pacifistic in tone, nonaggressive in fact, but not negligent of British interests.

Gladstone's major thought was for Ireland and British domestic problems, and under ordinary circumstances international affairs were left to his three Whig foreign secretaries, Lords Clarendon, Granville, and Rosebery. Nevertheless in all major decisions Gladstone participated actively, such as those which concerned the Alabama claims, the relations of the British government to the two belligerents in the Franco-Prussian War, the Afghan

frontier, the occupation of Egypt, British diplomacy in South Africa, negotiations with Bismarck in regard to German colonial expansion, and the proclamation of a protectorate over Uganda.

Only a most captious critic could find fault with Gladstonian diplomacy in 1870-1871. He succeeded then in protecting Belgium; and he did all that mortal man could do to preserve peace in Europe. In regard, however, to those international questions which arose during the second ministry it is a different matter. Gladstone inherited a bad situation from Disraeli in the Near East, in Egypt, and in South Africa. From the standpoint of the author he treated it with consummate skill; but from that of the reviewer the policies of the prime minister in those regions are open to criticism.

Thus, in regard to the Treaty of Berlin, Britain had assumed responsibilities for the preservation of order within the confines of the Turkish Empire which Gladstone was unwilling to fulfill; but he was also unwilling to surrender Cyprus, booty obtained by his predecessor. So likewise in Egypt. Disraeli, not Gladstone, had involved England here. The latter struggled long, determinedly, and successfully against the declaration of a protectorate over that country. He refused to see that occupation involved a virtual protectorate, irrespective of legal words. It would have been more logical had Gladstone either followed his friend John Bright in this matter and not have intervened at all by force of arms, or else have acknowledged what was a fact. Once force was used, the country occupied, the responsibility was England's.

There are very few errors in this book, but one noticeable one may be found in regard to the Transvaal. "They gave the Transvaal Boers what they wanted . . .", writes Professor Knaplund (p. 89) of Gladstone's settlement of the Majuba Hill defeat. What, of course, the Boers wanted was complete independence. They were highly dissatisfied with the Convention of Pretoria (1881) and pressed for a new one in which the hated British suzerainty would not be asserted. In 1884 they won a partial victory in the Convention of London. There was in it no mention of suzerainty; but since the new agreement contained no preamble the British at the end of the century were able to maintain that suzerainty still continued since its assertion in the preamble of the first convention had never been repudiated.

Granting that this question was merely a lawyer's quarrel, it is nonetheless indicative of a certain weakness in Gladstone's foreign policy. That British statesman was given to circumlocution, to cloudy and to somewhat ambiguous courses. Despite pacific intent this weakness was a contributing factor in bringing about the Boer War. If Disraeli's imperialism compelled Gladstone to intervene against his will in Afghanistan, Egypt, the Sudan, and in South Africa it should also in all fairness be conceded that Gladstone's temporizing and uncertainty in his Transvaal diplomacy (1881-1884) was in some measure responsible for the Boer War (1899-1902).

Princeton University. WALTER PHELPS HALL.

Before the War: Studies in Diplomacy. By G. P. Gooch, D. Litt., F. B. A. Volume I, *The Grouping of the Powers.* (London and New York: Longmans, Green and Company. 1936. Pp. viii, 438. $4.00.)

Mr. Gooch has been recognized as the foremost English writer on prewar diplomacy since his *History of Modern Europe, 1878-1919* was published in 1923. But of recent years he has been so engaged as one of the editors of *British Documents on the Origins of the War* that he himself has contributed little to the thorny theme except the useful *Recent Revelations of European Diplomacy*, in which the principal books published since the close of the war are reviewed and analyzed. Now that his editorial labors are nearly finished, he begins the publication of a full-dress study of the years 1898-1914. Inasmuch, however, as the chronological development of these years has already been traced by numerous writers in many lands, Mr. Gooch has elected to follow the careers and analyze the politics of the principal statesmen, selecting two from each of the five great powers. In this first volume Lansdowne, Delcassé, Bülow, Izvolski, and Aehrenthal are portrayed; "a second and concluding volume, it is hoped, will appear in two or three years, containing studies of Grey, Poincaré, Bethmann Hollweg, Sazonov and Berchtold" (p. vi). If no Italian is included, it is partly because no Italian documents have been published, partly because no Italian diplomatist can be said to have counted for much during these years. Except for a few pages devoted to the last years of Aehrenthal, the story told ends with 1910 when Izvolski was appointed ambassador in Paris and "the grouping of the powers" had become apparent.

Opinions will probably differ as to the success of the "personal" approach made by Mr. Gooch. Certainly it is convenient to be able to follow the policy of any foreign minister for his entire period of office, and to measure the five statesmen against each other. Also we are able to see the various incidents and the several crises from the point of view of each side; nor is the repetition which this method involves necessarily objectionable. Nevertheless the plan as here worked out is not free from disadvantage. Thus the history of the *Entente cordiale* has to be pursued in two chapters. For the study of Lansdowne gives the details of the negotiations concerning Egypt, which was of primary interest to Great Britain, while the corresponding negotiations over Morocco, where France was primarily concerned, are set forth in the account of Delcassé. Or again, the quarrel between Izvolski and Aehrenthal over Bosnia is not fully presented in the study of either man. Mr. Gooch is very skillful in selecting the facts pertinent to an understanding of the statesman he is analyzing; but precisely because he reduces his repetition to a minimum, the reader does not obtain a complete picture except by shifting from one statesman to another. If more than two powers are involved, as in the Morocco crisis of 1905, the problem is even greater.

The essays are described as "studies in diplomacy", and Mr. Gooch confines himself to the exchanges between governments, which are recorded in great fullness and with encyclopedic knowledge. Those acquainted with the great collections of diplomatic documents will appreciate how keenly these materials have been combed for obscure points and telling quotations; at the same time the innumerable memoirs have been searched for illumination of the documents. Nothing essential has been omitted; the perspective is admirable, the tone moderate and fair, the style clear. What Mr. Gooch has done need not be done again, for he refuses to classify his statesmen into saints and sinners and gives vent to no moral indignation. Only a purblind Frenchman or an obstinate German could object to the picture here drawn of Delcassé or Bülow.

Some readers will probably feel that Mr. Gooch confines himself too closely to the diplomatic game. True, he refers from time to time to economic forces or public opinion or the machinations of the press, but he, so to speak, takes them for granted, and he does not attempt to penetrate beneath the surface. Internal politics are but casually considered. Of course an author is always entitled to delimit his subject and Mr. Gooch has deliberately restricted himself to diplomacy. Nevertheless the impression is often left that the diplomatists were automata acting *in vacuo*. It is to be hoped that some day Mr. Gooch will apply his great knowledge to an examination of the underlying forces of diplomacy, their ramifications and their interactions.

Lansdowne, who in most writings is usually overshadowed by his predecessor Salisbury and his successor Grey, receives full justice from Mr. Gooch. "By his breadth of conception, his firmness, his conciliatory temper, his skilful technique, he had won high rank among British Foreign Secretaries. . . . He had taken the helm at a moment when Great Britain was morally no less than politically isolated. . . . When he laid down his burden, the position of the country appeared far safer and stronger" (p. 86). On his first great achievement, the Anglo-Japanese alliance, Mr. Gooch writes: "The treaty rendered a Russo-Japanese conflict more likely, a general conflict more unlikely" (p. 22); and: "The Foreign Secretary had made no real attempt at Tokio to avert the war, and when it came, made no attempt to end it" (p. 75). The entente with France was "an immense achievement", but "not an unalloyed gain", for "the price of partnership with a great Power is entanglement in its feuds" (p. 63).

Of Delcassé Mr. Gooch is more critical. Though "it is unjust to ignore his historic achievements", for the reconciliation of France with Italy and England "changed the face of Europe", "no statesman of the Third Republic made a grosser miscalculation" when he attempted to ignore Germany in Morocco (pp. 182-183). On the day of his resignation, as is well known, Delcassé declared that Great Britain had offered an alliance to France, "and

he reiterated the statement to the end of his life" (p. 58). There is no trace of this in any British document, and "where [the offer] came from remains unknown to this day" (p. 60). Mr. Gooch is not convinced by the recently published French evidence (*Documents diplomatiques français*, 2e série, tome VI), which merely shows that "Cambon and Delcassé read into [Lansdowne's] words more than he had intended to convey" (p. 57). "Cambon believed that an alliance was in sight, and Delcassé shared his opinion"; actually all that Lansdowne had proposed was "continuous consultation" (p. 176). The documents support this contention. Whether Cambon genuinely misunderstood Lansdowne or whether there is still something unrevealed, therefore, remains a mystery.

On Bülow the verdict is that passed by practically all writers outside and a good many inside Germany. "The position of Germany was undubitably weaker in 1909 than in 1897, and even a successor wiser than himself would have been unable to repair the mischief that he had wrought or failed to prevent" (p. 283). Though "seriously handicapped by the blazing indiscretions of his master, the *enfant terrible* of Europe, and by the stark intransigence of Tirpitz", Bülow's "clumsy handling of England and France was mainly responsible for the increasing isolation of which his countrymen complained". Mr. Gooch's sober narrative must convince even those who admired the prince-chancellor's charm and versatility that he lacked both character and convictions and that his policy was opportunist, shortsighted, and unreliable. His "brilliant and malicious memoirs" (p. 282) did his reputation more harm than good.

Yet severe as is his judgment on Bülow, Mr. Gooch's opinion of Izvolski is far lower. Izvolski began well by liquidating the Far Eastern situation and negotiating the convention with Great Britain. He also managed to keep on good terms with Germany and to maintain the Balkan entente with Austria. "Had he died in the autumn of 1907, history would have judged that a statesman of front rank had been lost to the world" (p. 306). But from 1908 onwards he steadily deteriorated. After Aehrenthal's shabby procedure in obtaining the concession for the Sanjak railway, it was astonishing that Izvolski should have left Buchlau without some agreed record of the conversations between himself and the Austrian minister. "If Aehrenthal was as unscrupulous as his rival alleged, Izvolsky was a dupe without the excuse of a novice. . . . The chastisement for his inadvertence was excessive but by no means wholly undeserved" (p. 363). It may be that his early successes went to his head, for he was vain, affected, and greedy (pp. 291-292). Unlike Delcassé, who went down with his flag flying, Izvolski condemned himself to ignominious surrender. "Henceforth he was a man with a grievance and something of a bore" (p. 363). But in Mr. Gooch's opinion the influence which he exerted on Russian policy after he became ambassador in Paris "has been exaggerated".

Of the quintet Aehrenthal was the most striking figure, for he came nearer dominating Europe than any statesman since Bismarck. Unfortunately he earned a reputation for devious dealing (pp. 402, 423) which he never entirely lived down. Furthermore, "Aehrenthal possessed courage in plenty, but he was singularly lacking in judgment and tact" (p. 383). His calculations over the annexation of Bosnia were upset by the course of events, and while this was "an outstanding achievement", it "raised more problems than it solved" (p. 437). So, while "there is no evidence that he was ever compelled, like some of his German colleagues, to adopt a course which he disapproved or to abandon a course which he desired to steer", and while he restored the position of Austria in Europe, his work was in vain. "The loosely knit European structure was too fragile to bear such shocks as the annexation of Bosnia." After 1909 Aehrenthal was for peace and the *status quo,* like Bismarck after 1871 (p. 415), but he set in motion forces which were to bring his beloved Hapsburg state to the ground within a decade. "He grasped at the shadow and missed the substance. Herein lies the tragedy of his career."

Tragedy is perhaps the word to be applied to all the statesmen here discussed, except Lansdowne. "All of them were men of ability; none of them were supermen. . . . All played the same game of *Machtpolitik* with different degrees of skill and success. Nobody dreamed of renouncing war as an instrument of national policy, and the rattle of the sword was never far away: for Europe was nothing but a geographical expression, and there were no recognized rules of the game. The haunting dangers of international anarchy were seldom envisaged, and no sustained attempt to remove them was made" (p. vi). In conclusion, it may be said that if Mr. Gooch discovers no new facts or adduces no new interpretations, his thoroughness and his objectivity should compel general acceptance of his conclusions.

The University of Chicago. BERNADOTTE E. SCHMITT.

British Documents on the Origins of the War, 1898-1914. Edited by G. P. GOOCH, D.Litt., F.B.A., and HAROLD TEMPERLEY, Litt.D., F.B.A. Volume IX, *The Balkan Wars,* Part II, *The League and Turkey.* (London: H. M. Stationery Office; New York: British Library of Information. 1934. Pp. c, 1190. $4.65.)

THE 1259 documents in this volume relate to the quarrels over the division of the Turkish carcass after the unexpectedly victorious attack of the Balkan Allies in October, 1912: Albania, Macedonia, Thrace, the Aegean Islands, and even Constantinople itself. The bitter disputes over a Serbian port on the Adriatic, Dibra and Djakova, and Scutari, as is well known, nearly involved the great powers in war, while the rival claims to Macedonia, Salonica, and Silistria did actually bring on a fratricidal conflict, initiated by Bulgarian treachery, among the Balkan states themselves. With

these British documents, which complement the German, French, Austrian, Russian (Siebert-Benckendorff) documentary publications, historians now have at their disposal for the war months of 1912-1913 the most complete diplomatic material for any period of history.

The establishment, at the suggestion of Sir Edward Grey, of a Conference of Ambassadors "to get rid of the difficulties between the Great Powers" (p. 207), which held sessions in London from December, 1912, to August 11 of the following year, brought about a real Concert of Europe. Under Sir Edward's skillful guidance and with the hearty co-operation of Germany, it succeeded in localizing the conflict and in preserving peace among the great powers. Its daily difficulties and methods of procedure can now be followed in the greatest detail. Its success made a deep impression on Sir Edward Grey, as he has recorded in his memoirs, and explains his suggestion for a similar conference in the crisis of July, 1914.

The cause of the Balkan Wars was of course the alliance of Serbia and Bulgaria, of which the full text and other pertinent documents are given in an appendix and of which Sir Henry Baxe-Ironside gave a remarkably full and accurate account in his dispatch from Sofia of January 6, 1913 (pp. 360-368). "Now that the fat is in the fire", wrote Sir George Buchanan five days after the war broke out, "one is inclined to ask who placed it there. . . . Russia as the prompter if not the actual creator of that alliance naturally incurs considerable responsibility", though Sazonov declared not very truthfully to him that "the Russian Government had taken no part in the drafting of the Treaty and had only seen the text when it was already parafé" (p. 33).

One of England's many fears was that "an attack by Christian Powers on Turkey will create a good deal of trouble" among England's Moslem subjects in India and elsewhere, "and I daresay we shall be reproached for not having put our foot down and averted the conflict" (p. 7, *cf.* also pp. 28, 45, 977). Another worry was jealousy of Italy's keeping a naval foothold in the Eastern Mediterranean through the retention of the Dodecanese and the Aegean Islands. The most serious preoccupation, however, next to the preventing of a conflict among the great powers themselves, was the preservation of the entente with Russia. As Sir Arthur Nicolson wrote: "It would indeed be most disastrous were a serious breach to be made in the good understanding with Russia. I do not disguise from myself that this understanding is of more vital interest to us than it is to Russia, though of course it is not necessary to let them know this. Were our ways to part we should be in a most awkward and difficult position, as Russia would then have a perfectly free hand to do what she liked in the Mid and Far East. . . . Again, we could not, were we to break off from Russia, maintain our relations with France on the same intimate and amicable footing as that on which they at present exist, and we should in fact be isolated and have to become the

subservient friend of Germany" (p. 45); Russian "friendship is really of more importance to us than that of France" (p. 709; *cf.* also pp. 34, 179, 227 f., 325, 327, 689 f.).

But it was not easy for England to pursue a straightforward policy for the preservation of European peace on a fair basis and at the same time keep up the entente with Russia, on account of the wobbling vagaries of Sazonov's mercurial temperament and the intrigues of Izvolski at Paris and of Hartwig at Sofia, not to mention Serbian swell-headedness and Bulgarian pig-headedness. "Sazonov is a sad wobbler" (p. 215); "Sazonov is so continually changing his ground that it is difficult to follow the successive phases of pessimism and optimism through which he passes" (p. 227); the French minister of foreign affairs told Bertie that the "policy of the Russian Government appeared to him incoherent and inconsequent" (p. 505); "M. Sazonov's attitude as regards Scutari is perplexing", Nicolson noted; "While criticizing M. Sazonov's tergiversations and vacillations as long as the net result is to preserve European peace we can bear with them, but in the future we should, before taking any action, ascertain from M. Sazonov what his policy is and whether he intends to abide by it" (p. 666). Of the dangers to European peace from the intrigues of Hartwig, who "manipulates the Serbians as he pleases", and "is more Serbian than the Serbians themselves and more Austro-phobe than the Serbians", there are many indications (pp. 199, 234, 621, 624, 664). In the question of Serbian access to the Adriatic, Grey and Nicolson thought "this arrogant language on the part of Serbia is fatiguing and ridiculous" (p. 153), but they felt that "Austria has acted with great conciliation and dignity and has shown great moderation and forbearance under considerable provocation" (p. 178).

In addition to the usual admirable index, historians will be grateful to Miss Lillian M. Penson for meeting the question raised by Professor Sontag: throughout the volume she has taken care to indicate as far as is possible to what extent the documents were circulated outside the foreign office to the prime minister, to the other members of the cabinet, and to the king.

Harvard University. SIDNEY B. FAY.

Die internationalen Beziehungen im Zeitalter des Imperialismus: Dokumente aus den Archiven der Zarischen und der Provisorischen Regierung. Herausgegeben von OTTO HOETZSCH. [Herausgegeben von der Kommission beim Zentralexekutivkomitee der Sowjetregierung unter dem Vorsitz von M. N. Pokrowski. Einzig berechtigte deutsche Ausgabe Namens der Deutschen Gesellschaft zum Studium Osteuropas.] Reihe II, *Vom Kriegsausbruch bis zum Herbst 1915.* Band VI, 1 and 2, 5. *August 1914 bis 13. Januar 1915;* Band VII, 1 and 2, *14. Januar bis 23. Mai 1915.* Band VIII, 1, *24. Mai bis 4.*

August 1915. (Berlin: Reimar Hobbing. 1934; 1935; 1936. Pp. xviii, xiv, 704; xviii, xvii, 844; xviii, 426. Each 42 M.)

THESE five volumes of documents from the Russian archives are but a small part of a project that promises to give the historian of recent European history the best collection of documents for the period. The plan calls for the publication of documents from 1878 to 1917. Thus far only a small portion has been published, for the period just before the war. These five volumes under review are the second part to be made available.

The thoroughness of the work is evident from the fact that about 2000 complete documents are here given in an account of the first year of the World War. Of these about 450 have been already published elsewhere. Painstaking editing supplies the student with references to or extracts from hundreds of additional documents. In the presence of such labor it is ungracious to call attention to a score or so of minor errors, that are of no consequence in comparison with the interesting and significant story that is told. A number of documents are here because agents of the Russian government intercepted and deciphered them. Since it is quite impossible to give an adequate review of all this material, it should be stated for those interested that the following countries and subjects are discussed: Afghanistan, Albania, Armenia, Austria, Balkans, Belgium, Bulgaria, China, Constantinople, Czechoslovakia, Dardanelles, Denmark, Egypt, England, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Japan, Military and Financial questions, Mongolia, Montenegro, Netherlands, Norway, Persia, Rumania, Russia, Serbia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Tibet, Turkey, Twenty-one Demands, United States, the Vatican, and Yugoslavia. Some of these subjects get scant treatment, for the larger part of the material concerns itself with the Balkan countries, Italy, Persia, and Japan. Readers are warned that the indexes are wholly inadequate.

The story told us by these documents is one with a familiar ending. Their value lies in their revelation of the detailed and devious negotiations leading to the policies pursued by the Entente powers during the World War. The chief problems facing England, France, Russia, and their eventual allies were three: First, to make sure of their own co-operation until victory was won; second, to win the aid of neutral powers either by persuading them to enter the war or by making their neutrality benevolently useful; third, to achieve those goals that were regarded as the fulfillment of manifest destiny and were defined as the sole base upon which to erect the future peace structure of Europe. The conflicts inevitably arising from the efforts made to attain these ends are the unedifying story of wartime diplomacy. The secret treaties mark the chapters.

The first step taken to assure co-operation was the signing of the Pact of London in September, 1914, by which act the Entente powers pledged themselves to make no separate peace with the enemy. Sazonov of Russia

urged this step, which along with many others taken by him in the early months of the war showed that he continued to take the initiative as he had done during the July crisis in 1914. Although Japan declared war on Germany, she was not asked to sign this pact. The documents reveal so much coolness between England and Japan that one readily understands the dissatisfaction felt in Japan for England and the desire for a *rapprochement* with Russia or even with Germany, once Kiaochow was taken. There were most serious differences between the Russians on the one hand and the English and French on the other over the question of Italy's entry into the war. Defender of Slavic interests, Sazonov was loathe to sacrifice any part of Serbia's future in the Balkans. When Italy was in the Entente camp, differences among the Allies became very acute. Serbia and Montenegro diverted troops from the Austrian front and occupied parts of Albania to keep Italy from taking what they desired. To many ardent Serbian nationalists Italy became a power more hated than Austria, and some Serbs went so far as to wish the Austrians a victory over Italy. The bitterness of the Serbs toward their allies became even more serious when England, France, and Russia sought to have Serbia cede Macedonia to Bulgaria for the latter's support in the war.

Military co-operation scarcely existed during the first year of the war. At the beginning there were occasional inquiries made of Russia by Joffre and Kitchener about her military needs and plans. As the months progressed, the conviction grew that real co-operation was necessary. The result was the summoning of a war council in France in July, 1915, and the working out of a scheme for the synchronization of efforts on the different fronts.

Economic co-operation likewise became necessary as the year went on. Competitive bidding of the nations for loans or for supplies caused confusion in England. A committee was set up in England to handle such requests, but it was difficult to satisfy Russia's very great needs. In July, 1915, Lloyd George feared the effects of competitive bidding by England, France, and Russia in the United States and proposed allied co-operation at the same time that he was sending to America a commissioner to revise the contract made with Mr. J. P. Morgan, the purchasing agent for England, whose two per cent commission was thought to be too high.

Sazonov felt early in the war that the Allies should have a program ready for the peace conference that was to follow the Entente victory. In an informal and unofficial conference, September, 1914, with the French and English ambassadors in Russia he made known his thirteen-point program. No answer was apparently made. But with the passing of time, as written agreements were made to get neutral countries into the war and as suggestions were made for a mediated peace, the feeling gradually developed that some program should be worked out. No final arrangements were made, however, of the nature suggested by Sazonov early in the war.

The efforts of the Entente powers in dealing with the second problem of neutrals are the subject matter of the bulk of this new documentary material. To gain the active military co-operation of neutral powers, every device possible was employed—bribery, promises of territory, threats, violence, newspaper propaganda, meddling in internal politics. In the main these efforts were directed toward Turkey, Italy, Bulgaria, Rumania, and Greece. England, France, and Russia differed in their points of view as they worked to gain new allies. The nature of the demand, the price to be offered, the time to make the approach, whether the approach should be made by one country or by all in concert—these questions and many kindred ones were argued for weeks before any steps were taken. There were times when Russia wanted Greece and Italy in the war; and there were times when the help of these two powers was not wanted, particularly when it was felt that they had aims of their own to attain in the neighborhood of Constantinople. After Italy had accepted Entente terms in the Treaty of London, there were many anxious moments as Italy delayed her declaration of war on Austria, as she failed to declare war on Turkey and Germany, or when she raised objections to anything that was done to assuage the injured feelings of the Serbs or to win the support of the Greeks by offers of territory in Albania.

By comparison with Entente preoccupation with neutrals in Europe, an attitude that approaches indifference is found in the question of relations with the United States. There was at times in some people a fear that the United States might mediate for peace, and in one case the fear that the United States might intervene in the war on the side of the Entente! At another time the Russians were afraid that Jewish bankers, hostile to Russia because of the treatment of Jews, would turn American sympathies to Germany. Any sign that the United States might mediate was regarded as favorable to Germany. Peace before the defeat of Germany was the source of such fear that the pope was criticized for calling for prayers for peace. Mr. Morgenthau, the American ambassador in Turkey, thought in January, 1915, contrary to the convictions he had when describing the "Potsdam Conference", that President Wilson could mediate for peace between the warring nations because the war came about independently of the will of any statesman and because no country could be blamed for it (see deciphered Austrian telegram, Pallavicini to Burian, January 10, 1915, VI, 643-644). Colonel House's trip to Europe early in 1915 to sound out belligerent nations about peace was thought of as a "phantastic attempt" of the United States to end the war to Germany's advantage. The Russian ambassador in Washington, Bakhmetieff, described Colonel House as naïve and inexperienced and completely bewildered by his first meeting with foreign ambassadors (Bakhmetieff to Sazonov, January 14, 1915, VII, 8-9). In the light of recent discussions about the entry of the United States into the war and rea-

sons for it, it is interesting to read that the English ambassador in Washington opposed our entry into the war because of the difficulties England would then have in getting supplies; that behind this opposition to American participation in the war was Mr. J. P. Morgan, who saw his profits and position as purchasing agent ruined by such a contingency (dispatch of Russian Military Attaché in Washington found in a dispatch of the Russian Military Attaché in Tokyo, June 8, 1915, VIII, 81).

Sweden's neutrality during the war is accounted for in several ways. Russia wanted it, for only through Sweden could she get needed supplies from England. When England interfered with Swedish shipping, Sweden simply prohibited all exports to Russia, who pleaded with England for a moderation of policy toward Sweden. Contrary to theorists upholding the opposite viewpoint, it seems to have been Sweden's bankers, industrialists, and workers who favored neutrality, whereas intellectuals, members of the royal court, army officers, and churchmen favored intervention on the German side.

Although it might be thought that the warring powers were fully occupied with winning the war and seeking neutral support, there seem to have been time and energy for imperialist endeavor. The strangling of Persia went on. England and Russia maintained troops in her territory despite her neutrality, arrested Germans, sought to remove and appoint officials, ordered the shah to accept premiers and cabinet ministers of their own choosing. Japan forced China to accept the Twenty-one Demands. Russia sought to sever Outer Mongolia from Chinese control. Russia worked for an independent Armenia that was to extend from the Black Sea to the Mediterranean, until the French interposed objections. An interesting development is the evolution of Russian aims in the Straits, changing from a policy demanding only that ships be permitted free use of those waters to a policy demanding absolute control of both sides of the Straits.

In this entire collection of documents there is to be found only one document suggestive of Wilsonian idealism. It is a message from the Belgian Socialist Vandervelde to Russian Socialists asking them not to hamper Russia in the task of defeating German militarism, the defeat of which would augur well for the eventual triumph of socialism and democracy.

Yale University. HARRY R. RUDIN.

The Treaty of St. Germain: a Documentary History of its Territorial and Political Clauses with a Survey of the Documents of the Supreme Council of the Paris Peace Conference. Selected and Edited by NINA ALMOND and RALPH HASWELL LUTZ. [Hoover War Library Publications, No. 5.] (Stanford University: University Press. 1935. Pp. xxx, 712, $6.00.)

To the number of those who are opening up the documentation of the

Paris Peace Conference—Professor Lapradelle with his *Documentation internationale,* David Hunter Miller with his *Diary,* and the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace with its series *The Paris Peace Conference: History and Documents*—there now appears a new and strong ally, the Hoover War Library at Stanford University.

The collection of 269 documents on the Treaty of St. Germain includes much that is not elsewhere accessible in print, and even the documents that are elsewhere available are in most cases drawn from the *Miller Diary,* of which there are only a few copies in the country, or the *Bericht* of the Austrian delegation to the Peace Conference, which is also a comparatively rare document, and one not elsewhere translated into English. The editors have woven into their volume a rich selection from mimeographed materials in the Hoover War Library—notably from the collection of "S-H Bulletins", which circulated among the American delegates during the Peace Conference, and from certain valuable guides to the deliberations of the Council of Four and the Council of the Heads of Delegations. One of the most useful items in the volume is the complete list of file number designations and dates of the meetings of all the successive supreme councils of the Conference—the Ten, the Four, the Three, and the Five.

The selection is well made. The reviewer regrets one omission, the minutes of the Plenary Session of May 31, which, as a separately published bibliography (*An Introduction to a Bibliography of the Paris Peace Conference*) shows, are available in the Hoover War Library.

The documents show among other things how the Austrian drive for recognition as a new state rather than an enemy state was broken by the firm resistance of Woodrow Wilson. The American position was in general more favorable to the new states than to Austria, not only on this point, but on the territorial clauses as well.

The story of the drafting of the territorial clauses does not include the minutes of the Committee on Rumanian and Jugoslav Territorial Claims, or of the Committee on Czecho-Slovak Territorial Claims. The first of these is available in photostat at the New York Public Library, at Columbia, and at Yale; the second, so far as the reviewer knows, is not available at any library. The documents here brought together tell the full story of the territorial negotiations after the committee stage, and show how the Conference yielded on some points to the Austrians, but on others bowed to the representatives of the Czechs and Jugoslavs. Dr. Beneš is doubtless glad in the year 1936 that the Conference was wise enough to reject his demand for the cession to Czechoslovakia of a strip of territory between Hungary and Austria.

The editors chose to put their documents into a topical rather than a chronological arrangement. With this decision, the reviewer has no quarrel. But in view of the necessarily fragmentary and imperfect way in which

Peace Conference documents must be published, it would be well in future publications to control the topical arrangement by some ample chronological listing, such as that which is used in publishing the *Foreign Relations of the United States*. As long as the chancelleries remain sealed, the historians will have to fit together their documents piece by piece. In this arduous work, every editorial aid is welcome.

Western Reserve University. ROBERT C. BINKLEY.

The Sino-Japanese Controversy and the League of Nations. By WESTEL W. WILLOUGHBY, Professor Emeritus of Political Science at the Johns Hopkins University. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press. 1935. Pp. xxv, 733. $5.00.)

'THE League labored and brought forth a Resolution.' That, in fine, is the summary judgment of our time upon the results actually achieved by the League of Nations from its efforts to find some equitable and acceptable settlement of the Sino-Japanese dispute over Manchuria. That judgment has the merit of realism in so far as the 'march of events' in Eastern Asia to date is concerned. It is the conclusion of the distinguished author of the volume here reviewed. "If one is to judge by the actual influence exerted by the efforts of the League upon the course of events in the Far East, it must be said that the League failed to secure any substantive results whatever, either by way of conciliation or restraint."

Dr. Willoughby's conclusion that Great Britain is primarily responsible for the failure of the League to act decisively in the Manchurian dispute will be appraised by historians in the light of Mussolini's subsequent defiance of the League in the Italo-Ethiopian campaign and of Hitler's bold move into the Rhineland. Such potentialities seem to have been unsuspected or ignored by 'men of affairs' like Sir John Simon. On the positive side, as Dr. Willoughby notes, there is the fact that the Chinese government has not yet recognized the new state of Manchoukuo. What may be the effect in years to come of the Lytton Report and of the final resolution of the League of Nations on the Manchurian controversy, the effect in developing new concepts of League jurisprudence and crystallizing now hazy notions of international law as to such concepts as 'self-defense' and the anti-foreign boycott, Dr. Willoughby's volume does not attempt to predict.

In this volume Dr. Willoughby has succeeded admirably in performing a dual purpose. In Part I he has written an account of the role of the League of Nations in dealing with the Sino-Japanese dispute from 1931 to 1935. No effort is made to deal, except by way of summary, with the broad historical background of the dispute, or to deal, except incidentally, as befits his main object, with the actual course of events in Eastern Asia. This work is not history in the ordinary sense, therefore, and should not be judged as such. It is an account, analytical rather than narrative in method, of political history.

It does not aim to deal with political history broadly, but confines its subject matter to that phase which is revealed in the official controversy between states spread upon the conference record of the League of Nations in Geneva.

In Part II the author, intensifying his analytical method and permitting himself here to pass personal judgment on the relative merits of the contentions of the disputants in the light of prevailing standards of international justice, deals in turn with such problems of League jurisprudence and international law as the following: Whether, under the Covenant or in international law, a state of war existed between Japan and China; what is the meaning of 'self-defense' in relation to the Pact of Paris; whether the Covenant of the League, the Pact of Paris, and the Nine-Power Treaty of the Washington Conference were violated by Japan; whether the anti-foreign boycott is a legitimate form of self-help, as a reprisal, under international law; and whether Japan's claim to an 'Asia Monroe Doctrine' is justified and at all comparable to its reputed prototype in the Western Hemisphere.

While these problems are of special importance to the jurist and to governments in the practical conduct of foreign affairs, rather than to historians, such questions, vital as they are in contemporary world politics, can neither be ignored by the historian nor be set aside as remote from realities. They are one class of the realities, and, as such, are of first-rate importance. In the course of actual international politics they are as much determiners of the course of history as economic facts, population and race problems, the urge to expansion, or the personal ambitions of political leaders. There was warfare on the Manchurian plains and in Shanghai. Armies clashed; soldiers were killed by the hundreds in bloody engagements; cities were destroyed and noncombatants compelled to abandon their homes to invaders. But had there been a declaration of war either by Japan or China, the whole course of the League's attention to the Manchurian dispute would have been radically changed. Why there was no declaration of war is not understandable except as a juristic question. One of the particular contributions of Dr. Willoughby's work is that he has dealt lucidly with just such realities.

Dr. Willoughby was technical counselor to Dr. Alfred Sao-Ke Sze, China's delegate at Geneva during the early phases of the League's attention to the dispute. With commendable frankness he admits in his preface that his personal sympathies "have, throughout the controversy, been strongly with the Chinese". Yet, on the whole, no fair-minded reader could doubt that he has achieved with singular scholarship that objectivity and impartiality he has sought.

Dr. Willoughby's volume, which is the most comprehensive and thorough account yet published of the official history of the Sino-Japanese dispute, is of special value to the general historian in three ways. It preserves in systematic form the essential content of the official documentation of the entire dispute. It organizes related materials into political categories in a

manner beyond the competence of the historian unspecialized in law and politics. And, what is hardly less important, it presents in amplification of an objective analysis a personal interpretation which derives genuine authority from the eminence of the author as a jurist, a scholar in the field of international law and relations, one who has had intimate personal association with the events of which he writes.

Washington, D. C. C. WALTER YOUNG.

BOOKS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

Dictionary of American Biography. Edited by DUMAS MALONE. Volumes XVII-XVIII, *Sewell-Trowbridge.* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1935; 1936. Pp. x, 636; x, 657. $12.50 each; $250 for the complete set.)

WITH the 680 biographies of Volume XVII and the 689 of Volume XVIII this alphabetical march of American notables draws nearer its final halt. A total of 12,267 have now passed in review, affording abundant instances of the richness and variety, the restless energy and sometimes tragic futility, of the human factors that have shaped American civilization. The present installments do not flinch from commemorating, along with John Sherman and former President Taft, such figures as J. A. Stoddard, inventor of the steam calliope, "General Tom Thumb" (C. S. Stratton), and Richard Ten Broeck, "the first American horseman to assert the prowess of his country on the English turf". Once and for all, the primacy of the Smiths is established in American life, for the *Dictionary* amply documents Arthur Guiterman's familiar encomium:

> In countless tasks they've proved their pith,—
> The tribe denominated Smith;
> They've stood their ground and have not quailed,
> Though White and Robinson have failed.
> I would not dim the fair renown
> Of Messrs. Johnson, Jones and Brown,
> But when I count the kin and kith
> Who bear the honored name of Smith,
> I know, with Lincoln, God must love them,
> Because he made so many of them.

From Abby Hadassah Smith to Xanthus Russell Smith they number 151, not including 8 Smyths and 2 Schmidts. The 81 Browns and Brownes of an earlier volume must be rated a poor second. Other names which attain numerical importance in the books under review are Thompson, Thomson, and Tompson, 50 memoirs; Taylor, 42; Stephens and Stevens, 32; Thomas, 30; and Stewart and Stuart, 30.

The seventeenth volume is the product of 363 contributors, the eighteenth of 377. The sketches maintain the same high level of scholarly accuracy

and terse English that has characterized the work as a whole. Among the outstanding memoirs are "Horatio Seymour" by Stewart Mitchell, "Thomas Joseph Shahan" by R. J. Purcell, "William Tecumseh Sherman" by O. L. Spaulding, jr., "John Smibert" by Theodore Sizer, "Joseph Smith" (1805-1844) by Bernard DeVoto, "Leland Stanford" by Stuart Daggett, "James Ewell Brown Stuart" by D. S. Freeman, "William Howard Taft" by H. F. Pringle, "Roger Brooke Taney" by C. B. Swisher, and "Tecumseh" by Katharine E. Crane. Certain figures, necessarily discussed with brevity in the *Dictionary,* deserve a more adequate portraiture elsewhere. Scholars seeking subjects for biographical treatment will find rewarding opportunities, for example, in the careers of Benjamin Silliman (1779-1864), William Smith (1727-1803), Edwin M. Stanton, Alexander T. Stewart, Frank R. Stockton, William Strong, and Ruth McEnery Stuart. One wonders why the following persons were denied admittance to the *Dictionary:* Mary F. Seymour (1847-1893), magazine editor; O. B. Shallenberger (1860-1898), electrical inventor; Christian Sharps (*ca.* 1811-1874), inventor of the rifle named after him; B. F. Shaw (1832-1890), inventor of textile machinery; W. A. Silver (1843-1888), playwright; Otto Singer (1833-1894), musical composer; P. J. de Smet (1801-1873), Jesuit missionary to the Indians; James L. Smith (1818-1883), chemist and mineralogist; Joseph M. Smith (1789-1866), medical scientist; J. B. Stearns (1831-1895), electrical inventor; Silas Stearns (1859-1888), ichthyologist; D. C. Stilson (1830-1899), inventor of the Stilson wrench and other mechanical devices; Lorimer Stoddard (1864-1901), actor and playwright; Max Strakosch (1835-1892), impresario; Oxenbridge Thacher (1720-1765), colonial pamphleteer; J. P. Thompson (1838-1899), inventor of textile machinery; Mary H. Thompson (1829-1895), surgeon; Wordsworth Thompson (1840-1896), painter; and J. M. Tracy (*ca.* 1842-1893), painter.

As in earlier volumes, the contributors have made no systematic effort to record parental occupations, though this is a point of considerable interest to students inquiring into the conditions determining the choice of life careers in America. This information is lacking in 248 of the 689 memoirs in volume XVIII, including those of such well-known persons as Moorfield Storey, J. J. Sylvester, Lewis Tappan (though the sketch of his brother Benjamin gives the information), Bert Leston Taylor, and Sara Teasdale. Three contributors repeat the elementary error, mentioned in earlier reviews, of using the word "impeachment" as though it meant "conviction" (XVII, 390; XVIII, 96, 443). The sketch of H. R. Stiles omits his authorship of *Bundling, Its Origin, Rise and Decline in America,* the work by which his name is chiefly remembered today. The memoir of Josiah Strong fails to point out the notable influence of his books in developing imperialistic sentiment among his numberless readers. An account of Thomas Sully without a reference to "The Boy with the Torn Hat", his best known picture, is

singularly incomplete. Not many will agree that Sumner's life of Andrew Jackson is the best that has yet appeared (XVIII, 219). The statement that the Whigs adopted no platform in 1848 (XVIII, 352) is incorrect. Many would question whether Maurice Thompson's literary reputation was "the most commanding of his generation in the Middle West" (XVIII, 460). It may be noted as an interesting innovation that the author of "David Smith Terry" takes to task certain earlier contributors to the *Dictionary* who touched on aspects of Terry's career. It is anticipated that the last two volumes of this memorable work will appear before the close of this calendar year.

Harvard University. A. M. SCHLESINGER.

Essays in Honor of William E. Dodd. By his former students at the University of Chicago. Edited by AVERY CRAVEN. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1935. Pp. ix, 362. $4.00.)

LORD Mahon thought some place in History should be allotted to historians. Certainly a teacher who has chronicled history so successfully as Professor Dodd should not himself be left unchronicled; and this volume of essays by students whom he has inspired and guided is a worthy tribute, ably edited by one of his outstanding students.

As in all collections, the contributions are of uneven merit. The first essay is an unhappy application of the Turnerian thesis. In "The Southern Backcountry on the Eve of the Revolution", Professor Philip Davidson undertakes to show that the Western region was opposed to the East; that the Revolution was an Eastern movement which was viewed with distrust and actually opposed by the men of the backcountry. Professor Davidson does not state where the West began in those days, but since he classifies Jefferson and Patrick Henry as Western leaders, he apparently considers the Tidewater as constituting the East. He has much to say of the North Carolina Regulators and the Scottish Highlanders, of the Moravians and other pacifistic sects, but nothing of the famous Mecklenburg and Fincastle resolves, or of the Battle of King's Mountain, or of the warfare carried on by the Whigs of the Kentucky and Tennessee country. It is true that the title speaks only of the eve of the Revolution, but the author dips into the Revolution itself. He seems to realize that the Revolutionary committees of the Western country were usually able to keep the Tories in check, but he apparently thinks that most of the Whigs were propagandists. The Eastern committees, too, had their troubles with Tories, but of this the author says nothing. There were jealousies and antagonism between East and West, but Revolutionary history cannot be explained on that basis alone.

Of particular interest is Maude Howlett Woodfin's essay on "Contemporary Opinion in Virginia of Thomas Jefferson", which is a study of the political career of the Sage of Monticello in his own state. It stresses the

seclusiveness of the great Democrat, and the indirect ways in which he carried on his political propaganda. The author sifts, not timidly and faintly but in a thorough manner, the charges made against Jefferson, and dismisses most of them as campaign libels, but the charge which linked his name with that of the wife of his friend, John Walker, is found to rest on fact.

Frank L. Owsley's study, "America and the Freedom of the Seas, 1861-65", treats of a neglected phase of our history. In that period America was more interested in other forms of freedom than in the freedom of the seas; and her method of enforcing the blockade gave much annoyance—and at the same time, much comfort—to the British nation.

"The Ideology of American Expansion", by Julius W. Pratt, comes near to being an amusing study. It discusses the "piousity" with which Americans have, in successive generations, clothed their acquisitive designs, and comes to a climax with William McKinley whom God advised to annex the Philippines. "But", says the author, "McKinley's God did not hesitate to converse with him in terms that might better have befitted Mark Hanna."

Lofty language has served as a garb for many ambitions other than the desire for additional territory, and the essay by Laura A. White on "Charles Sumner and the Crisis of 1860-61" illustrates the various purposes to which it can be put.

Of these essays dealing with the three major interests of Professor Dodd's school of historians—the South, the Northwest, and diplomacy—all embody sound research. Only the first should be classified as of the doctrinaire variety.

The University of Virginia. THOMAS PERKINS ABERNETHY.

The Records of the Virginia Company of London. Edited by SUSAN MYRA KINGSBURY, Carola Woerishoffer Professor of Social Economy, Bryn Mawr College. Volume IV. [Library of Congress.] (Washington: Government Printing Office. 1935. Pp. xvi, 637. $4.00.)

MISS Kingsbury's fourth and last volume covers the three year period from the opening of 1623 to 1626. Into that short span of time were crowded some of the most momentous events of Virginia's early history. The tobacco contract negotiated by Sir Edwin Sandys with Lord Treasurer Middlesex brought to a head in the spring of 1623 the prolonged and embittered factional strife in the company. Just when the minority faction, led by representatives of the most substantial adventurers, failed in its attempts to defeat the contract in the company's courts, news from Jamestown brought for the first time a true appreciation of the state to which the colony had been reduced after the Indian massacre of the preceding year. Appeal was made to the privy council for an investigation. By a commission to Sir William Jones and others the company was put into receivership. It was dissolved the next year upon the recommendation of these commissioners, and through

quo warranto proceedings in king's bench made necessary by Sandys's refusal to accept gracefully the council's decision. Thus did Virginia become the first royal colony.

Of the many collections from which Miss Kingsbury has drawn her material, several are worthy of special note. From the Manchester Papers she has included the mass of evidence submitted by Sir Nathaniel Rich as spokesman for the Smith-Warwick faction in condemnation of Sandys's policies. The value of these papers lies partly in the corrective they provide for the unfavorable, and in the main unfair, interpretation of the motives inspiring the attack upon Sir Edwin. His own side of the story may be followed more closely in several important items from the Ferrar Papers. Official government documents, taken largely from the Public Record Office, are of immense value in following the procedure of the privy council in handling this difficult problem. They clearly demonstrate that the initiative and responsibility lay almost entirely with the council and not the king, and thus go far to dispose of the contention that the personal animosity of James I toward Sandys was a major factor in the overthrow of the company. The Sackville Papers, more fully published in the *American Historical Review* (XXVII, 493-538, 738-765), are extremely valuable in studying the tortuous but crucial problem of the tobacco contract. The Manuscript Records of the Virginia Company, vol. III, owned by the Library of Congress, enable the student to follow the painful recovery of the colony from the massacre and to study the repercussions of the struggle in London on the colony.

Several of the more than three hundred seventy documents included from these and other collections require special mention. The most interesting is the "Records of Proceedings upon Information of Quo Warranto" in the court of king's bench from November 4, 1623, to May 24, 1624, the most important single discovery in the editor's search for new material on the company's history. The document, published both in the original and in a translation by Dr. Hubert Hall, covers over one hundred pages of the text. Of great value also is the "Commission to Sir William Jones and Others" of May 9, 1623. For the period after the dissolution chief interest attaches to the commission of July, 1624, "to certain Lords of the Privy Council and Others for settling a Government in Virginia", and to the "Discourse of the Old Company", a defiant protest issued the following year by the embittered Sandys faction.

Space will not permit other specific references. Suffice it to say that with this concluding volume the editor has provided ready reference to a remarkably complete record of an early English colonial enterprise. It should be noted, however, that the additional Ferrar Papers, the discovery of which was announced in the *Magdalene College Magazine* for June, 1932, have not been included. Limited funds and the heavy burden of labor imposed merely in executing the editor's original project, first outlined a generation ago,

made this impossible. The value of these new Ferrar Papers is uncertain, as no detailed classification of them has as yet been published. The slight acquaintance the reviewer has with them, gained from nothing more than a glance at a few selected items on display in the College Library, suggests a duplication of much of the material in the Manuscript Records of the Virginia Company, vol. III, especially in the official communications between the company and the colony. This impression is strengthened by the fact that the Ferrars served as deputies to the company, and handled much of this correspondence. But there are 1448 new items in this collection, of which 416 are reported as relating to the Virginia colony, and closer examination may yield rich returns. It is to be hoped that they will in time be made more easily available to American students.

In conclusion, notice should be taken of the larger importance of Miss Kingsbury's four volumes. For there is danger that students of the period may regard the work as having only a restricted and limited interest. It does deal principally, of course, with the early history of Virginia. But there is far more than that. Much may be gleaned from these pages regarding the sister colony of Bermuda. And since these two settlements represent the principal efforts made in the first quarter of the century, the whole field of early English colonization is here laid out for our closer examination. A penetrating light is also thrown upon the larger field of economic history. Useful information will be found regarding business organization and method, the state of English trade and shipping, the question of prices, and the economic theories guiding men of that day. Furthermore, a valuable opportunity is afforded for study of the relationship of the government to modern economic enterprise. Those who would speak of the privy council, of government finances and tariffs, of mercantilism, and of early colonial policy will find aid here. And while those interested in Parliament will be disappointed in the paucity of information bearing directly on the subject, the opportunity to take more exact measurements of men like Sandys, Rich, and Warwick should not be overlooked. In short, all students of the period are greatly indebted to Miss Kingsbury, and as well to the authorities of the Library of Congress, especially to Dr. J. Franklin Jameson for his valuable work in seeing the last volumes through the press.

New York University. W. F. Craven.

Select Cases of the Mayor's Court of New York City, 1674-1784. Edited by Richard B. Morris, Assistant Professor of History in the College of the City of New York. [American Legal Records, Volume II. Edited for the American Historical Association by the Committee on the Littleton-Griswold Fund.] (Washington: The American Historical Association. 1935. Pp. vii, 777. $7.50.)

The law administered in the British colonies in North America before

1700 differed widely in both procedure and substantive rules from the law laid down in contemporaneous English reports of decisions and in the great treatises by Coke and others to which we still look for authoritative expositions of the common law. Various attempts have been made to explain this divergence. Reinsch, in his essay on "The English Common Law in the Early American Colonies", pictured the settlers as cutting loose from the common law and developing a folk law all their own, until at the time of the Revolution this country underwent a wholesale adoption of a foreign legal system from England analogous to the reception of the Roman law in Germany or Scotland. Others have described the Puritans as insisting upon being governed only by Divine ordinances and substituting Leviticus for Coke. On the other hand, recent scholars have been more cautious and have shown that the resemblances to English law are more numerous than were previously realized. Plucknett (*New Eng. Quar.*, III, 157-158) pointed out the indebtedness of early Massachusetts statutes to English models and Bond (*Proceedings of the Maryland Court of Appeals*) brought out the technicalities of suits in Maryland.

In 1931, Goebel (*Columbia Law Rev.*, XXXI, 416 ff.) made the interesting suggestion that the problem had been made unnecessarily difficult by the false assumption that English law was limited to the common law as applied in the king's courts, which formed the chief basis of the treatises and law reports above-mentioned. He urged that the settlers had had a much greater familiarity with English local courts, such as the county courts and the mayor's or recorder's courts in London and various boroughs, and that they naturally drew on their experience of the somewhat informal procedure and doctrines of these local courts when they were called upon to set up a machinery of justice in a new land. One obstacle to an adequate appraisal of the validity of Goebel's theory was the sparsity of readily accessible information about the English local courts. Until we knew more about them, we could not tell satisfactorily whether the colonial courts were actually like them.

Professor Morris's introduction to the present book has gone far to meet this need. He has compiled from many scattered sources continuous accounts of the mayor's court in medieval towns generally, and in London during the Middle Ages and later times. He reviews the jurisdiction of this London court, and shows how many of its proceedings were based on customs of the city which differed from the common law, such as foreign attachment, suits by and against married women engaged in trade, slander suits for charges of minor offenses, and the admissibility of account books in evidence. Similar proceedings were common in the Mayor's Court in New York. In addition, the London court furnished precedents for the equity and maritime jurisdiction exercised by local colonial courts.

It is too soon to regard Goebel's theory as completely proved. More evi-

dence will have to be gathered in Engand and in several colonies before we can consider the English local courts as the most powerful influence upon early American law. However, Goebel's argument is undoubtedly strengthened by these New York records. Furthermore, they weaken the theory that Massachusetts law was mainly Biblical, although capital offenses were defined according to Mosaic ordinances. Despite the dissimilarities between the Puritans in the Bay Colony and the Dutch and Anglicans in New York, the Suffolk County Court (*Records of the Suffolk County Court, 1671-1680*) and the New York Mayor's Court have many resemblances to each other and to the Mayor's Court in London.

Morris relates the history of the Mayor's Court of New York during the Dutch and Colonial periods and after the Revolution until it became the Court of Common Pleas in 1821 and was merged in the Supreme Court in 1895. The introduction concludes with descriptions of the bench and bar of the court and the nature of its records.

It is to be wished that this excellent summary of the history and organization of the Mayor's Court had been accompanied by a discussion of some of the chief legal questions presented by the material in the body of the book. What sources of law are recognized by the cases? Are English decisions and treatises cited? Is it fatal for a plaintiff to select the wrong form of action? What doctrines of substantive law are emphasized, and do these differ from the contemporaneous English law? Unfortunately the reader must go through the whole text of the book in order to answer these questions. The introduction does comment at some length on Rutgers *v.* Waddington, an important case concerning the confiscation of Tory property, but otherwise the reader is left to find out for himself what is in the cases. Although he will get some help from the arrangement of the material in the body of the book under different headings according to subject matter, a page or two of comment at the beginning of each heading is much needed, and it would be useful to have in a footnote occasional editorial reflections upon an interesting case.

The difficulty of extracting the meat from the cases is greatly increased by the almost total absence of paragraphing. The eye soon wearies when obliged to run over three or four pages of solid type without an indentation. Probably this arrangement is due to a desire for fidelity to the records which are not paragraphed. Nevertheless, the editor would have made his book much more readable if he had adopted some method of breaking up the text and indicated at the beginning of his introduction that such an arrangement was his own work.

The cases are grouped under eight main headings. This has its advantages, as already indicated, but the lack of chronological order makes it impossible to get a picture of the work of the court at any single period. Such a picture would be particularly desirable before 1700.

Chapter I on "Jurisdiction" includes material on such administrative business as price fixing, charitable relief, health regulations, and prison supervision. In the "Procedure" chapter are many cases on foreign attachment, two cases on the admissibility of account books, and a few cases illustrating trial by jury. The next heading, "Persons", deals with the admission of freemen; aliens and naturalization; supervision over apprentices, orphans, and minors; relief for debtors, showing the operation of a colonial statute preventing the imprisonment of seamen for debt; soldiers; and husband and wife, with many suits based on the claims and contracts of a married woman. Forms of action are illustrated by cases of ejectment, debt, detinue, replevin, account, covenant, trespass, case (examples of deceit for breach of warranty being especially numerous), trover, assumpsit, and accord and satisfaction. The chapter on "Commercial Law" covers negotiable instruments, bills of lading, public auctions and market overt, and arbitration. "Maritime and Admiralty Business" includes violations of navigation and revenue laws; prizes and privateering; contracts and torts on the high seas; maritime freight contracts as to freight, passengers, and employment; and bottomry. Chapter VII on "Quasi-Equity Business" shows the court occasionally giving the relief which in England was furnished by the Court of Chancery. The cases relate to a mortgage, a trust, the specific restitution of chattels, mistake, a deposition in perpetual memory, and rescission for breach of warranty. The last chapter on "Crime" is short, because such matters were usually handled in a separate court of sessions composed of the same officials as the Mayor's Court. The book ends with a table of cases and an index of both proper names and subjects.

Harvard University. Z. CHAFEE, JR.

The Foundations of American Diplomacy, 1775-1823. By SAMUEL FLAGG BEMIS, Farnam Professor of Diplomatic History, Yale University. Volume I, *The Diplomacy of the American Revolution.* [The American Historical Association.] (New York: D. Appleton-Century Company. 1935. Pp. xiii, 293. $3.50.)

"My endeavor", Professor Bemis says in his preface, "has been to present, I think for the first time, a balanced and somewhat condensed narrative of the diplomacy of American independence, that is to say, the diplomatic history of the American Revolution." These words are apt to arouse expectations which the ensuing volume will not satisfy altogether. The consideration which Professor Bemis gives to proceedings on this side of the Atlantic is throughout most incidental. Adopting the present reviewer's thesis (*French Policy and the American Alliance*, Princeton, 1916) that French intervention in the War of Independence was motivated by the ambition of Vergennes to recover for the French crown its former role on the Continent, Professor Bemis transfers himself from the outset to the European scene, nor

does he, except for now and then a few pages or paragraphs, quit it to the end.

Of the book's eighteen chapters, seven of the first eight are devoted principally to the turns and twists of French policy which eventuated in the Alliance of February, 1778, and to the closely related story of Vergennes's efforts to bring Spanish policy into alignment with his own, which were finally rewarded by the Treaty of Aranjuez of April, 1779. Thanks to materials made available by the works of Yela (1925) and Urtasún (1920 and 1924), as well as to his own researches in the Spanish and French archives, Professor Bemis is able to amplify prior accounts somewhat, but the essentials of the story supported by Doniol's great collection from the French archives remain unaffected. In his preface Professor Bemis characterizes Doniol's "monumental publication" as "too dominantly French in its point of view and presentation of documents". From this statement the reviewer must dissent. It seems to him that Professor Bemis's own pages confirm the representativeness and essential completeness of Doniol's collection.

Chapters IX to XIII, inclusive, of the present volume narrate the parallel stories of the Armed Neutrality of 1780 and of the Netherlands' disastrous plunge into war. Though drawn in the main from secondary works in German, French, and Dutch, they furnish a valuable addition to American knowledge regarding the topics of which they treat. It must be conceded, nevertheless, that neither the Armed Neutrality ("Armed Nullity", the Czarina termed it) nor Dutch participation in the war on British sea power contributed materially to the outcome of the War of Independence. For the "balanced" narrative which Professor Bemis promises in his preface these chapters seem disproportionately lengthy.

The concluding group of chapters (XIV-XVIII) traces the steps leading to the Peace of 1783. Here certain generally held views are subjected to fresh scrutiny and some significant revision. The account given of boundary questions, which is greatly aided by the author's sketches superimposed on the Mitchell Map of 1755, is particularly instructive. In the old controversy between the admirers of Jay and Franklin Professor Bemis unostentatiously and judiciously renders judgment for the latter. He shows that Franklin did not have to await stimulation from Jay to go ahead without consulting the French. He also points out, what seems evident once it is pointed out, that Jay's scruples regarding the original form of Oswald's Commission did *not* result in the determination of the question of American independence prior to the treaty. Indeed, he suggests, and not without plausibility, that the delay which resulted from Jay's insistence on this punctilio may have resulted in the United States getting a less favorable treaty than they would have had had they proceeded more briskly.

Some minor features of the volume to which the reader's attention should be directed are the discussion of the question of "the lost million" (pp. 35-40); the statistics of French and Spanish financial aid to the Americans

(pp. 89-93); the summary of Spanish military activities in the region of the Mississippi (p. 102, n. 17); the account drawn from Professor Bemis's earlier volume of the Hussey-Cumberland Mission of 1780-1781 (pp. 105-106, 172-173, 176, 181-183); the summary of British peace efforts following Yorktown (pp. 191, 202); the account of Shelburne's and Jay's dream—suggested by the teachings of Adam Smith—of free trade between the United States and Great Britain (p. 236), and of Hartley's still more remarkable vision of "a federal alliance" between the two countries (pp. 249-250). It would appear that it was British friends of the American cause who were slowest to recognize the implications of American independence, just as today it is the friendly Briton who is readiest with his views of this country's duty.

Professor Bemis writes with humor and acumen, and has an especially discerning eye for the importance of personal factors (see *e.g.*, pp. 192, 194-195, 224). His chief fault is a tendency to overcrowd his canvas. He promises "a somewhat condensed narrative", and too often he has fulfilled his promise. A little more consideration of the problem—as Lowell described it—of what to leave in the inkhorn would have enhanced the readability of this volume.

Princeton University. EDWARD S. CORWIN.

Guide to the Diplomatic History of the United States, 1775-1921. By SAMUEL FLAGG BEMIS, Farnam Professor of Diplomatic History in Yale University, and GRACE GARDNER GRIFFIN, Editor of "Writings on American History". [Library of Congress.] (Washington: Government Printing Office. 1935. Pp. xvii, 979. $2.50.)

THIS is a work of importance and value. Some account of the content and scheme is a requisite preliminary to discussion. The book can hardly be put into any category of a single word; the authors say, rightly enough, that it is not a bibliography "in the strict sense"; and while they call it a "guide", the present reviewer, who has had the privilege of use since the stage of galley proofs, thinks it something more, or at least something other than a mere guide.

The field and period covered are indicated in the title. The first part of the volume (pp. 1-779) consists of twenty-three chapters, generally in topical and chronological arrangement (*e.g.*, "The Confederation, 1783-1789"; "Slavery and Expansion"); but the concluding chapter (nearly as long as any) is on "General Works, Historical Publications and Aids"; moreover, there are subdivisions of the chapters, some 150 in all; and even under these subdivisions there is classification such as "Bibliographical Aids", "General Works", "Special Works", "Printed Sources", "Manuscript and Map Suggestions". The references are serially numbered, with abundant cross-references; within Part I are to be found ninety per cent of the total (5318 out of 5812); and to the library title of a work there is added in most cases

a few words of descriptive or critical evaluation, *e.g.*, "still the best account".

Part II (pp. 785-942), in three chapters, is called "Remarks on the Sources". Apart from such remarks, it deals specifically with records, public and private, in print and in manuscript; it includes lists showing the whereabouts of papers of Presidents, Secretaries of State, and American diplomatists (pp. 862-883), and accounts of archives in other countries (pp. 890-942).

For the whole work there is an index of collections of personal papers and an author index, which, it may be noted, contains something like 3500 names.

Perhaps most scholars will be surprised at the volume of indicated material in a field of modern history which, while of great importance, is, after all, quite limited both in range and in time.

Doubtless one of the major tests of such a work as this is to be found in its inclusions; but another is in its exclusions. Obviously an attempted bibliography or list of all relevant printed items would be of almost impossible length and quite unusable even if possible. One need only think in this connection of Miss Hasse's Index and of the Check List of Public Documents.

The omissions are the background and the necessary accompaniments of the *Guide;* thus in some degree it is to be used as a bibliography of bibliographies; the reader is referred to these, without repetition of their lists, which are merely selectively used. American biographical works are not ordinarily cited, because of the *Dictionary of American Biography;* and in so far as it deals with archives the work is to be thought of as a guide to guides.

The foregoing summary account is necessarily inadequate; but it will serve its purpose if it induces the user of the *Guide* to give some preliminary study to its methods and arrangements; it is clear that much thought has been devoted to the making of these convenient and helpful; and the experience of one student has shown that familiarity with them greatly facilitates the necessary selection of desired information.

On the merits the present critic can give only a favorable judgment. The learning and industry of the authors are evidenced throughout. Their comments on the cited works are informed opinions, with all of which, of course, no one will agree; and the chapter on the nature of the sources is one that is worth reading by and for itself. It would, to quote the words of Professor Bemis and Miss Griffin, "imply a certain omniscience" to say that the citations of writings relevant to a period of nearly a century and a half are throughout complete and properly inclusive; but within a limited range of particular examination only one unmentioned volume has been noticed, that of Roa Bárcena entitled "Recuerdos de la invasion norte-americana", the writer of which had available the papers of Bernardo Couto, one of the Mexican plenipotentiaries who signed the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo.

This guide is very fittingly dedicated to Dr. Jameson. Certainly its authors are entitled to the thanks of the community of scholars interested in the history of American diplomacy; and to all that company, from the rank of undergraduate to that of leading authority, the *Guide* will be a very constant help, for it is a worthy book of reference of a character which has hitherto been unavailable.

Washington, D. C. HUNTER MILLER.

The Command of the Howe Brothers during the American Revolution. By TROYER STEELE ANDERSON. (New York: Oxford University Press. 1936. Pp. vii, 368. $3.50.)

THIS book needed to be written, and meets the need. In these days the serious historian is concerning himself more and more with the Revolution, so that in part its history is now being rewritten with modern methods, but (as it were) in yearly sections. Two of these have already appeared, by different writers, and in the course of time the remainder should be completed. The defects of such rewriting of our history is its inconsecutiveness and lack of oversight of the whole. Again, the smart historian is also concerning himself with the Revolution, in similar sections, chiefly biographical and marvelously flippant. Mr. Anderson's book is needed for both schools of writers. The serious worker will gladly seek it, the surface skimmer must take notice of it, and both will be benefited.

This is a historian's book. Concerning itself not at all with what came before or after, nor indeed with anything extraneous, it handles the problem of Sir William Howe with minute and unflagging persistence. Of Sir William alone, for his brother the admiral appears but briefly. Knowledge of conditions and even of events is assumed; the methods of eighteenth century warfare, on which the writer to a great extent relies, are not explained; and the writer does not pause to depict the plodding persistence and sudden attacks of Washington who, as Howe's evil genius, deserves more than the tardy compliment at the end. Even battles are scarcely described. Trenton, Brandywine, and Germantown are hastily passed over; Princeton is not mentioned; and while the preliminaries of Bunker Hill are examined, the change in its strategy and tactics are not studied, nor is Howe's personal participation in it considered.

The account of Bunker Hill contains Mr. Anderson's only noticeable error in fact. He ascribes the British mortality to rifle-fire. But we have no proof that there was a single rifle on the field. Riflemen did not begin to join the American army until the arrival of the Pennsylvanians and Virginians, weeks later. The deadliness of the musket-fire of the New Englanders was due first to their waiting until the British were within very close range, and second to their coolness in taking individual aim.

Mr. Anderson, in studying the Howes, confines himself to a close examina-

tion of general conditions, to plans and changes of plans as expressed, chiefly, in dispatches, and to deducing from them the general's varying mental stages. Indeed, on the whole this is a monograph on William Howe's states of mind, designed to set at rest the hundred and sixty years' speculation on his ineffectiveness. Howe came to the war with a good reputation; on a few occasions his military skill and overwhelming successes made him seem all but great; he captured New York with ease after Washington had spent weeks in preparing its defenses; and he brushed him aside and took Philadelphia with equal ability. Yet on the whole Howe's efforts were futile. He seldom controlled more territory than his army stood on, he avoided battle quite as often as he accepted it, he did not pursue his enemy after a single victory, he idled away three winters in three different cities, and he finally asked to be relieved of his command. From Charles and Harry Lee, who fought against him, to his latest offhand biographer, Howe has been a puzzle, solved in different ways, none finally. Mr. Anderson has provided an all but authoritative answer, which future historians must, on the whole, consider sound.

Outstanding is the author's logical and complete fairness. At each turn of Howe's career, immediately at the time and cumulatively when he resigned, he was criticized by his own people. The frontal attack at Bunker Hill, the halt in operations at Brooklyn, the hesitation at White Plains, the decision to take Philadelphia rather than to assist Burgoyne, the failure to attack Valley Forge: these and other seeming errors were brought as reproaches against Howe, first in a pamphlet war, and next in a parliamentary inquiry. Each one of them Mr. Anderson examines in turn, always with close study of contemporary conditions. It was easy, after each event, to prove the mistake. But dissecting each in the light of foresight rather than hindsight, submitting, as must now be agreed, that Howe was no military genius, and relating each action to the routine and almost prescribed methods of European warfare, Mr. Anderson makes it plain that according to Howe's standards he was justified in each of his decisions. He pauses, as any historian must, to demolish the old suspicion that Howe, as a Whig, was favoring the American rebels. And he slowly builds up the conclusion that Howe was not equal to a task which was greater than any Englishman suspected, that the baffling conditions which he met were progressively too much for his talents, and that the growing consciousness of failure, both against his adversary in the field and against lack of support from home, eventually induced a pessimism which brought his military career to an end. In no book has Sir William Howe been more fairly treated and, by consequence, in none has his inadequacy been more completely laid bare.

As Mr. Anderson distributes neither praise nor blame, his dry and highly analytical method leaves various questions in the student's mind. If Howe failed by following his lights, should he not have turned to others? Quite

as much as Washington he here appears as a Fabius: ought he not to have taken more risks? He took scarcely one. Should he not have made plain, to those at home, his needs in the field? Ought he not to have discovered some means to turn, effectively, the numerical strength of the Tories into military force? He did not even build up Loyalist regiments to garrison his posts and set his own army free for the field. And though his plan for 1777 was approved by Germain and known to Burgoyne, should not Howe have perceived how essential was Burgoyne's success to the winning of the war, and was it not the height of folly to put himself where he could not assist the northern army?

Even in regard to Howe's dissipation, which Mr. Anderson dismisses as affecting his success, the student retains a lingering doubt. Mr. Anderson argues that Howe's plans were always under the scrutiny and required the approval of his brother the admiral; but Lord Howe is so shadowy a figure in the book that his influence does not appear, while Mr. Anderson admits that it could not operate in the field. Was not Howe's fiber weakened, then, by his dalliance with Mrs. Loring and her successor? Already middle-aged, and softened by years of peace, did he not too much love the hearth, the bottle, the gaming table, and "the sex"? There is a memorable criticism of Howe embodied in the little sculpture in the Museum of the City of New York, which shows him turning from his glass and his mistress to cast a haughty and indifferent eye on the captive Nathan Hale. Howe did not suspect the homespun power that was operating against him.

The strength of the book in solving the mental problem of Sir William Howe is also its literary weakness. It is not a narrative nor even an exposition, but entirely an argument. That a historian reads the book with fascinated attention, and that at the end the author may justly write Q. E. D., does not make the book more attractive to the general reader. It is not to be supposed that the author adopted his method in ignorance of what he sacrificed. The book lacks picturesqueness, movement, personal interest. Indeed, for a book so closely devoted to the analysis of one man, it is marvelously impersonal. We do not see William Howe—his imposing form, his heavy but still handsome features, his magnetism so strong in spite of his gloomy silences. We are shown not one of his battles, nor the pomp of the English army, nor a glimpse of the makeshift regiments that opposed him. Rarely has a book demanded of its reader more previous knowledge of its subject. Seldom has a book on war been less warlike. The war becomes a war of dispatches, a "paper" war. The obstinate and energetic king, the difficult Germain, the petulant Clinton, even the formidable Washington, fade into the background. And yet as Howe stands always the central figure the author does, by touch after touch, construct the image of a mind never too brilliant, and handicapped by formal training, which could not free itself from its limitations, nor meet unfamiliar conditions, nor strike through to

victory. Defend Howe's military decisions though the author may, he arrives at a sum total of indecisiveness that proves to be Howe's outstanding, self-destructive feature.

Concord, Massachusetts. ALLEN FRENCH.

Manifest Destiny: a Study of Nationalist Expansionism in American History. By ALBERT K. WEINBERG, Fellow of the Page School and Lecturer in Political Science in the Johns Hopkins University. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press. 1935. Pp. xiii, 559. $4.50.)

THIS work traces the American attitude toward territorial expansion from a mood of relative satiation at the close of the Revolution through the mounting acquisitiveness of the period of continental occupation, an acquisitiveness expressed in deeds and justifications equally distasteful to modern sensibility. It reaches a culmination in the overseas imperialism of the turn of the present century, and discovers a distinct current reaction traceable to the economic unprofitableness of overseas adventure. For disappointment over unprofitable commitments is readily transmuted in the alchemy of a national consciousness into a virtuous distaste for what under happier economic auspices won almost universal acceptance.

To follow the chapter captions of the author, expansionists have justified their accomplishments under an ideology ranging from "Natural Right", "Geographical Predestination", and the "Destined Use of the Soil", a destiny very harsh toward previous occupants, through an "Extension of the Area of Freedom", a "True Title", divine and infinitely superior to any held by more or less primitive predecessors to whom expansion constitutes, after all, only "The Mission of Regeneration". Other captions, such as "Natural Growth", "Political Gravitation", "Inevitable Destiny", are self-explanatory in one sense, but are here fortified by a wealth of information most patiently gleaned. "Paramount Interest" is applicable especially to the Panama Canal Zone and the negotiations incident to American predominance therein. "Political Affinity" describes a disappointing approach to *rapprochement* with Canada. Concluding chapters are devoted to "Self-Defense", "International Police Power", and "World Leadership". The author closes his exhaustive work with the sane reflection that "If the past has bequeathed the fullness of its spirit to the present, America's pursuit of a destiny is not yet ended", an idea which he finds to have been most effectively presented long before in Walt Whitman's "Leaves of Grass".

Thus the work is a complete survey of United States history from the Revolution to the present, from the single viewpoint of shifting national attitude toward expansion and imperialism. Based on a multiplicity of sources and fortified by an elaborate apparatus of scholarship, the numerous quotations give the work much of its value at the same time that they

weight its style and convert it almost into a book of reference, discouraging to general reading.

This highly scientific document is nevertheless warmed by a very human demonstration of the correlation between wishes, national as well as personal, and their philosophic justification. What the community wants intensely, its articulate elements find the way to justify. Just as slavery once found earnest proponents in religion and philosophy quite as well as in economics, so expansion and imperialism, when they seemed socially desirable and inevitable, found men ready to place them on foundations of the necessary dignity. If in our present day, expansion is in disrepute and expansionists are correspondingly old-fashioned—are even wicked if they are foreigners seeking gains in Manchuria or Ethiopia—the author is wise in holding that the present national mood is not necessarily the final. He even doubts that modern heirs of earlier expansionists have a monopoly of virtue. Their isolationist attitude is positively dangerous in its rejection of all responsibility toward a world which rightfully looks to America, if not for leadership, at least for intelligent participation, in world affairs.

Thus notwithstanding a wealth of detail, a meticulous attention to apparatus, and a result that enlists the craftsman's admiration, it is as a philosophical contribution that *Manifest Destiny* makes its chief appeal.

Purdue University. LOUIS MARTIN SEARS.

Treaties and Other International Acts of the United States of America. Edited by HUNTER MILLER. Volume IV, *Documents 80-121; 1836-1846.* (Washington: Government Printing Office. 1934. Pp. xxvi, 855. $4.00.)

THE second volume (the first was a preliminary print of contents and scheme) of this official collection of American treaties and other international acts established the series immediately as the standard and authentic edition for time to come. The third volume, with a rich content of technical and historical notes, gave to the series an added distinction of erudition unparalleled in any other official collection of treaties, matched only by the late Frances G. Davenport's unofficial edition of *European Treaties bearing on the History of the United States and its Dependencies* (unfortunately broken off at 1713 by the death of that renowned woman). Miller's fourth volume, covering the period January 20, 1836, to June 10, 1846—a decade of great importance in the Latin American relations of the United States, and in problems of American expansion—expands this apparatus of notes to an extraordinary degree, with an even richer supplement of material, digested from archival sources in the Department of State and foreign repositories, and illuminated by the editor's unequaled knowledge of these documents, the intricate technicalities in which they abound, and the problems of law and of

diplomatic practice which they have raised. Particularly enlightening are the voluminous data which accompany the texts of the Webster-Ashburton treaty of 1842, and the Mexican treaty of 1843.

In dealing with the British treaty the editor not only summarizes, after a fresh study of the sources on both sides, the complicated history of the questions settled in 1842, including the famous northeastern boundary dispute, but he presents with great thoroughness (and with the assistance of Colonel Lawrence Martin's notes on Mitchell's Map) the cartographical and historical background of that famous dispute. This includes the new evidence now available in the form of the Aranda transcript of Franklin's red-line map of 1782, discovered in the Archivo Histórico Nacional of Madrid, in 1933, from information picked out of Aranda's contemporary dispatches by this reviewer. This transcript gives clinching evidence of the justice of the American claim to the boundary of Maine as maintained before Daniel Webster's concession of 1842. The various other details of the "battle of the maps" are here marshaled and explained by the editor with great completeness.

In his reproduction of the Mexican treaty Dr. Miller departs from his established rule of selecting as his authentic text, whenever possible, one of the signed originals (usually that embodied in the President's proclamation) in the Department of State; because in the case of the treaty of 1843 with Mexico the English text of the department's signed original copy was made by a scrivener unfamiliar with the English language, and is full of errors, some of them gross. The English text of the signed original in the Mexican archives, on the other hand, is "all that it should be", and the editor prints it (from an authentic facsimile) as the accepted English text, giving the imperfect text from the department's files in the notes.

These two treaties, texts and notes, serve as examples of the great care and nice scholarship which pervade the whole volume, and which make this series so indispensable to the historian and to the jurist, and to the practicing diplomat. Many other examples could be given, and much more space could be devoted to the merits of this publication. May the editor live long to bring the task, completed, down to his own days, the original *terminus ad quem*. Despite his already great services to his country, Miller's collection of treaties will very likely be his most enduring monument.

Yale University. SAMUEL FLAGG BEMIS.

Oliver Evans: a Chronicle of Early American Engineering. By GREVILLE BATHE AND DOROTHY BATHE. (Philadelphia: Historical Society of Pennsylvania. 1935. Pp. xviii, 362. $12.00.)

IT is passing strange that a comprehensive life of Oliver Evans, American millwright, inventor, author, and manufacturer, active in the first three

decades of our Republic, should not have been attempted earlier. The lives of his British contemporaries, Watt and Trevithick in particular, have been adequately treated, not once but several times. And in America we have had more or less satisfactory biographies of John Stevens, of John Fitch, and even of lesser men like James Rumsey and Nathan Read. The only noteworthy sketches of Oliver Evans's life have been those by Henry Howe, fourteen pages in his *Eminent American Mechanics* (1840) and of Coleman Sellers, jr., sixteen pages in the *Journal* of the Franklin Institute (1886).

To many persons the name Oliver Evans suggests a clumsy scow on wheels, the "Orukter Amphibolos", and not much more. Thus do spectacular achievements capture the public mind to the exclusion of accomplishments perhaps more valuable. But this is not the place to evaluate Evans's contributions to the early American manufacturer, to enumerate his eighty varied inventions, or still less to review his technical publications or quote his uncannily accurate prophecies. The authors have drawn a true picture of his accomplishments, from which anyone versed in these techniques should be able to draw his own conclusions. Mr. and Mrs. Bathe have avoided making extravagant claims for Evans, such as were made by some of those who wrote briefly of him in the nineteenth century; one could wish that all biographers were equally detached in their points of view. Specifically they emphasize the incontrovertible fact that Evans's two outstanding contributions to American life were his many improvements in the manufacture of flour by ingeniously devised machinery and the introduction of the high-pressure steam engine into commercial manufacturing.

As one turns the attractive quarto pages one easily visualizes Evans as a prolific, picturesque, and vigorous letter writer. Some fifty letters by him and more than thirty to him are quoted in full. Among his correspondents were Washington and Jefferson (both of whom used his mills and paid him royalties), Madison, Fulton, Stevens, and Livingston. The letters cover the latter half of his life (1786-1818), and nearly all relate to his flour mills, steam engines, or other patents.

One cannot but speculate, while reading of Evans's early struggles to keep financially afloat, as to what might have happened if he had cultivated the friendship and secured the backing of Chancellor Livingston, as Fulton did; or if he could have commanded resources comparable to those of Colonel John Stevens; or had found a financial partner such as James Watt prized in Matthew Boulton. If Evans's birthplace had been Devon instead of Delaware, or if he, instead of his agent Sampson, had gone to England in 1795, might he not even have anticipated George Stephenson in locomotive development? Of course such speculations are of little worth. But a book like this stimulates thinking along these lines. Perhaps indeed this is one measure of the value of a historical or biographical work. Another test of a

biography is whether or not it seduces one to read further of the period and milieu which it covers; the Bathe biography with its wealth of incidental references assuredly does.

Between the lines one learns much of American life of post-Revolution days—much which is neither of engineering nor of technology. For example, Evans became involved in protracted litigation as he endeavored to bring infringers of his patent rights to terms. Watt, a few years earlier in England, was able to have even a Hornblower ignominiously thrown into jail for a similar offense. And ex-President Jefferson was not too busy at seventy to write Evans a long letter full of sympathy and kindly advice, commenting judiciously on a governmental ruling which affected Evans vitally. The authors quote from an interleaved edition of Evans's *Abortion of the Young Steam Engineer's Guide* in which he penned interesting comments and a little philosophy. On one page for example, Evans wrote (Mar. 8, 1812): "Robert Fulton has bet with me a beaver Hatt that my Boat building for the Mississippi will not run 10 miles per hour and a suit of clothes that my Boat will not run nine miles per hour. I take him up." Fulton was more than right, it never ran at all.

The Bathes have aimed at thoroughness, and have by every standard succeeded. They seem to have exhausted all possible original sources of information, both here and abroad. Their work is the most painstaking and scholarly study yet made of the life work of any American engineer. And it is typographically attractive. There are fifty-nine full page plates, including some of original drawings, and maps, mostly contemporaneous, also a few illustrations in the text. The arrangement is that of a journal, almost rigidly chronological throughout, with no division into chapters. The sixty-four page appendix quotes much documentary material.

The reviewer has only three or four minor criticisms. The code of footnote abbreviations seems to him unnecessarily intricate, requiring as it does two pages of explanation. And he prefers a division into chapters to the chronological arrangement adopted by the authors, for such a large work cannot be absorbed at a single sitting. The authors lean backward in thoroughness when they quote in full the deed description covering lands associated with Evans's childhood. And Evans's Harvard-bred contemporary, Nathan Read, deserves at least a footnote.

Yale University. RICHARD SHELTON KIRBY.

Cyrus Hall McCormick: Harvest, 1856-1884. By WILLIAM T. HUTCHINSON, Associate Professor of History, The University of Chicago. (New York: D. Appleton-Century Company. 1935. Pp. viii, 793. $5.00.)

THE first volume in this biography, *Seed-Time, 1809-1856,* was published in 1930 (*Am. Hist. Rev.,* XXXVI, 835). *Harvest, 1856-1884,* com-

pletes the life of Cyrus H. McCormick and carries the history of the harvesting machine industry to 1885. As in the earlier work the author has exploited to the fullest the mass of correspondence in the libraries of the McCormick Historical Association and the Nettie F. McCormick Biographical Association in Chicago. Other members of the family as they were connected with the industry take a prominent place until the volume becomes a history of a great American industry through its formative period. After 1856 Cyrus H. McCormick, sr. passed from the inventor to the manufacturer and capitalist. Mrs. McCormick was far from a silent partner in business affairs, and in the latter years, Cyrus H. McCormick, jr. forged forward as the real founder of the final corporation that grew out of the father's labors.

The story is told in great detail, sometimes tedious and labored, but because of the painstaking researches of the author the more satisfactory for serious students of industrial history. It is difficult to appreciate the reasons for the recital of the family quarrels except as evidence of the complete freedom given the author. McCormick remained a conservative, old-school Presbyterian to the end; and the church conflict that he fostered is a dreary one that might well have been greatly condensed. A severe critic would challenge the pages given to General Lee at Washington and Lee (pp. 289-291) as out of place. There is an interesting chapter on "Grasshoppers, Grangers and Growth of Industry, 1873-1879". It appears that the grasshoppers caused the McCormicks more loss than the Grangers. The chapter on "McCormick and the Civil War" indicates the difficult position of a Southerner in the North during the Civil War; in this case a Douglas Democrat veered to the position of the Peace Democrats. McCormick was an unsuccessful candidate for Congress in 1864. Like many others he thought the Union lost if Lincoln insisted on emancipation of the slaves, and to be saved only by stopping the war. "Stop the war", he said, "declare an armistice—call a convention and consider terms of peace." In every part of the work Dr. Hutchinson presents the record of a notable American, an aggressive industrialist, conservative in party and church, a generous giver, and withal a likable personality. In his lifetime he amassed a fortune of $10,000,000, but in return he left mankind with the burdens of harvest time greatly lessened.

Western Reserve University. ELBERT J. BENTON.

Pratt, the Red Man's Moses. By ELAINE GOODALE EASTMAN. [Civilization of the American Indian.] (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press. 1935. Pp. 285. $3.00.)

MISS Goodale's reputation as an author was earned many years ago by her poems written as a girl about her native country of the Berkshires. She is the author also of a volume of Indian legends and of a number of works of fiction. Early in life she was a teacher of Indian students at Hampton Institute and in Dakota, and was supervisor of Indian education under the

Federal government. She is, therefore, eminently qualified to write a biography of the founder and principal of the famous Carlisle Indian School.

Richard Henry Pratt was a national figure in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, and the Carlisle School was his monument until the World War, when the school was discontinued, and the barracks which had been lent for the purposes of the school, were turned back to the War Department. He entered the Army during the Civil War and at its close spent a number of years at various frontier army posts on the plains, where he took a prominent part in many campaigns against hostile tribes. In these campaigns he not only gained wide knowledge and experience of the red man as a foe but acquired also a sympathetic understanding of him as a man. The experience was to be of great service to him later when, as a commissioned army officer, he was detailed to civilian duty in charge of a body of Indian students.

Thereafter the story of Captain (afterwards General) Pratt's life is substantially the history of Indian education in this country. In 1878 he was put in charge of a band of conquered braves at Fort Sill, who were to be banished without trial to some remote Eastern fort, there to be held indefinitely as prisoners. They were Kiowas, Comanches, Cheyennes, and Arapahoes—"the finest untutored cavalry in the world".

The story of that forced migration, whether read in the dry-as-dust chapters of official reports, or in the more picturesque and entertaining language of the newspapers, or in the detailed narrative in Mrs. Eastman's book, is one of the most thrilling and appealing tales in the annals of frontier life. Throughout the journey Captain Pratt's humane feelings for the unhappy prisoners, combined with his strict insistence upon army discipline, is a revelation of the character of the man. Heavily shackled hand and foot, mobbed by the populace along the route, ragged, unkempt, and morose, and guarded by soldiers at every turn, they were herded into a stout enclosure at Fort Marion in St. Augustine, Florida, where they were confined—to the constant terror of the surrounding white people who lived in continual expectation of an outbreak and massacre. But Captain Pratt won their confidence through his wise exercise of justice and mercy, so that gradually a change came over the spirit of the red men. They decided that they wanted to learn to "walk the white man's road". They were allowed to guard themselves. Earnest women taught them to read, and when at length they were allowed to petition Washington they did not ask to be returned to the West. Consent was granted for a chance at schooling and when (in 1878) a sympathetic response was received from General Armstrong, Principal of Hampton Institute in Virginia, Captain Pratt escorted seventeen of the younger braves to Hampton. That was the beginning of the Indian Department at Hampton Institute—a colorful novelty in the educational field that for years afterwards attracted and interested a host of visitors to the school

and enlisted the attention of officials and philanthropists alike. The Carlisle School was started soon afterward under Captain Pratt. Within a year the enrollment had grown to two hundred and eventually it reached two thousand.

Captain Pratt, the founder of Carlisle, was a living dynamo, with all the enthusiasm and singleness of aim of a crusader. Temperamentally extreme, he fought valiantly for his own opinions and had little sympathy with the immobile, conservative, and autocratic government bureaucracy in charge of Indian affairs. He was opposed to the tribal life as fostered by the Bureau. His favorite slogan was: "To civilize the Indian get him into civilization. To keep him civilized let him remain there." Everywhere and always he carried on vigorously his campaign for equal rights and equal opportunity for the native Americans. He took a prominent part in the Mohonk Indian Conferences which for twenty-five years had a considerable influence on Indian policies, but their moderate resolutions were never radical enough for him, since he had no gift for compromise.

Many chapters in Mrs. Eastman's book are devoted to the development of Indian education through the medium of the non-reservation boarding schools and the reservation day schools for the younger pupils. It is a tale of many and diverse threads woven into a varied pattern, suggestive sometimes of the crazy quilt. Some of the more prominent workers in this field are described and there are brief biographies of graduated students. It is a useful contribution to our literature on the subject, for nowhere else, perhaps, is there such a concise and condensed survey of this field. Nevertheless it makes disconnected and disjointed reading, lacking in sequence and smoothness of narrative. But what one misses most in the book is any direct contact with the subject of the biography. Somehow the virile, pervasive personality of the man eludes the reader and one lays down the book with a feeling that one knows a good deal about the man, but not the man himself, with his compelling combination of lovableness and obduracy; the man who was beloved and sometimes feared by his pupils, and who alternately charmed and exasperated his friends and colleagues—the man whom Glenn Warner, the famous coach, declared to be "the best friend the Indian ever had".

The Library of Congress. WILLIAM LINCOLN BROWN.

Our Times: the United States, 1900-1925. By MARK SULLIVAN. Volume VI, *The Twenties.* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1935. Pp. xx, 674. $3.75.)

MR. Sullivan's sixth volume of *Our Times* follows his usual customs; wanders through the postwar years, touches a few matters in detail, mentions others barely, and deals with most political and public happenings not at all. It falls into three subdivisions. The first is virtually on one topic, a history of the nomination of Harding, his election, the appearance of scandals in his

administration, his death, and the subsequent investigations, exposures, lawsuits, and sentences. There is practically nothing on the civil or diplomatic events of the years nominally covered. The narrative is entirely devoted to the "human interest story" of the weak, unfortunate, well-meaning man who was forced by a stronger will into the candidacy, nominated to his own dismay, and mercilessly victimized by his associates after he had been swept into office. In telling the various "stories", especially of the convention of 1920, Mr. Sullivan makes efforts at criticism which give his narrative an independent value. His methodical plan for checking up on every detail of the "smoke-filled room" tradition and his display of the varying bits of evidence constitute a little problem in the weighing of contemporary and later testimony.

The second part of the work consists of two long chapters on the books and the songs of the twenties, after his well-known manner, but with rather greater emphasis on the psychological significance of the new developments than in some of the earlier volumes. The third part is a chronicle by years, of the events of the period with little beyond mere mention on Mr. Sullivan's part. It would be difficult to find much, if any, significance in this list of miscellaneous items and they give the final volume of this extensive enterprise a rather flat ending.

This reviewer, like his predecessors, rises from reading the book with a strong impression that if Mr. Sullivan had chosen to write a history of American politics, or better, of the American state of mind, during twenty-five years, he could have produced something of unique value. The fifteen-page analysis of the postwar mentality of the American people with which the volume opens, and the later chapter on "The United States when Harding became President" have the clarity and effectiveness of reflections by a shrewd contemporary who is also an experienced newspaperman. His treatment of the postwar literary insurgency, which he relates closely to the economic and other influences of the times is singularly objective and well-balanced. His chief shortcoming lies in the brevity of his handling and in his failure to carry through his principal subject to its conclusion. The amazing way in which juries refused to convict Sinclair and Doheny, and the complete blasting of the Democratic hopes of damaging the Republican party by dwelling on the scandals in 1924 are barely mentioned although they constitute one of the most striking social phenomena of the period.

As usual the illustrations are well selected and amusing, although they lack the features of quaintness and burlesque which brought delight to every adult who turned the pages of Volumes I and II. The fact is, we are still in the period that Mr. Sullivan describes and the date with which he closes his book—1925—although eleven years in the past, is one in which the thoughts and standards of the public bear no aspect of the obsolete or naïve. Nothing that has happened in the intervening decade has taken us

very far from the social, literary, and political fashions of those days. Most of the writers he mentions are still writing; some even of the songs are still sung. Perhaps it is just as well to bring the series of volumes to an end and allow sufficient time to elapse to enable some Mr. Sullivan of the 1950's to find our activities and our ideals as humorous as we now find those of the far-off nineties.

Williams College. THEODORE CLARKE SMITH.

American Neutrality, 1914-1917: Essays on the Causes of American Intervention in the World War. By CHARLES SEYMOUR. (New Haven: Yale University Press. 1935. Pp. vii, 187. $2.00.)

Can we be Neutral? By ALLEN W. DULLES and HAMILTON FISH ARMSTRONG. [Publication of the Council on Foreign Relations.] (New York: Harper and Brothers. 1936. Pp. 191. $1.50.)

THE first of these studies of American neutrality is carefully confined to our neutrality experience during the Great War, and to the reasons which decided the United States to join the Allies. Professor Seymour examines the allegation that we were drawn in because of our financial interests and the desire to keep open the avenues of our lucrative trade with the Allies. He considers that those who entertain these views rely to a great extent upon misinterpretations of the meaning or significance of certain documents—namely the Page cablegram of March 5, 1917; President Wilson's St. Louis speech on September 5, 1919; and Secretary Lansing's letter of September 6, 1915.

The Page cablegram is frequently cited as evidence of the influence of economic interests in bringing the United States into the war. The ambassador suggested the probability of a collapse of Allied credit unless loans were authorized, and emphasized the danger, if they were denied, to American economic interests dependent upon trade with the Allies. But the author hardly needed to tell us that Ambassador Page's cablegram had little significance, since it is well known that he exercised practically no influence either upon President Wilson or Secretary Lansing.

President Wilson in his St. Louis speech did declare that "the seed of war in the modern world" was "industrial and commercial rivalry", and said: "The real reason that the war that we have just finished took place was that Germany was afraid her commercial rivals were going to get the better of her, and the reason why some nations went into the war against Germany was that they thought Germany would get the commercial advantage of them." And in the same speech he said, "This war in its inception was a commercial and industrial war; it was not a political war."

However much influence these economic considerations may have exercised in certain quarters, these documents do not reveal the reasons why

President Wilson, who held our foreign policy in the hollow of his hand, decided that we should enter the war. President Wilson's true attitude was indicated in his Mobile speech of October 27, 1913, before the outbreak of the war, when he declared: "It is a very perilous thing to determine the foreign policy of a nation in the terms of material interest."

The third document, Secretary Lansing's letter of September 6, 1915, in which he pointed out the serious consequences which would result to American industry unless credit were extended to the Allies, is admitted to have influenced President Wilson to reverse our policy in regard to extending loans to the Allies. But President Wilson in so acting was thinking of the economic welfare of the nation as a whole and not of any special interests such as munitions makers or bankers. He would naturally try to avoid a general industrial and financial depression which might have resulted from a collapse of our foreign trade.

After all the evidence is examined in an objective and judicial spirit, it is difficult to escape the conclusion which the author reaches that the real cause of our entry into the war was Germany's recourse to her reckless submarine campaign.

In regard to our future neutrality policy, Professor Seymour warns against automatic embargoes as "apt to prove dangerous as well as futile. They withdraw from the Executive a power which may be of great value in his efforts to preserve peace" (p. 175).

The problems of neutrality "under modern conditions are so complex that there is no practical method of assurance against implication in another European war once it started. Legislation designed to isolate us from the rest of the world raises hopes that cannot be fulfilled, for it does not take account of the facts. . . . If we attempt a policy of isolation, we must be prepared, by developing an armament of such size that it will seriously impress the other nations, forcibly to protect our ultimate vital rights as a nation. Thus only can we create and maintain, for a period, an artificial isolation. . . . For our own ultimate salvation", he concludes, "we must stand ready to cooperate vigorously with the States whose welfare, like our own, depends upon peace. We must support every measure calculated to stamp out the immediate threat of war whenever it appears" (pp. 177-180).

In order to answer the question which challenges the attention of the whole nation, "Can we be Neutral?" Mr. Dulles and Mr. Armstrong first examine what course we adopted upon previous occasions when the problem of adhering to a policy of neutrality arose. The consequent brief survey of our diplomatic history constitutes a really remarkable condensation in which all but the essential factors have been eliminated, without in any manner destroying the relative importance of events, or interrupting the sequence of the historical development. The record is brought down nearly to the end

of 1935, and it even includes a discussion of the Neutrality Act of August 31, 1935. The act itself is reproduced in one of the fourteen carefully selected appendixes. And in order that this concise account may still lack nothing in completeness, a "Bibliography on American Neutrality", some six pages in length, is added.

The chapter entitled "Our Future Neutrality Policy", taken by itself, is a masterly summary of the whole problem of neutrality. It is there pointed out that "whatever neutrality legislation we have already adopted or may adopt cannot possibly be more than a frame work, raised in the air, to support the specific policy which, in contingencies yet unrevealed, best promises at a moment of crisis to keep us out of war" (p. 77). The authors approve the provisions of the August, 1935, legislation, which limits travel on belligerent vessels, and hope that it may long remain on the statute books with very little change. They consider that the "chief purpose of the provision, 'to protect the lives of American citizens,' recognized that loss of American lives through the action of a belligerent is the event most likely to jeopardize the maintenance of our neutrality" (p. 80). After discussing an arms embargo and the question of foreign bonds they suggest that our financial transactions with a belligerent should be limited to the matter of commercial banking credit or private loans, since they are the normal facilities extended to that part of our trade which under other provisions of our neutrality law would probably be allowed to continue. "Any undue extension of banking credit to cover trade with belligerents could be controlled to a considerable extent by the Federal Reserve Board" (p. 90).

Searching how we might best avoid being drawn into war against our will, the authors conclude: "The President should have discretionary power, within limits to be set by Congress, to impose embargoes on shipments to belligerents of goods and commodities useful in war; but to instruct him to enforce this provision automatically is dangerous" (p. 114). Just as in the case of the preceding study, it is emphatically declared that the United States has "a direct, material, selfish interest that hostilities shall not break out anywhere" (p. 118).

This concise and admirable study of the actual problem of neutrality as it confronts us today is as well adapted for the general reader as it is for the jurist and historian. It should aid in the education of public opinion in regard to a rational neutrality policy and should serve as a guide for legislative action.

It is noteworthy that both of these studies emphasize the fallacy of the belief in our supposed isolation and both agree that our safety lies in cooperative action to prevent war rather than in an attempt to avoid becoming involved after the outbreak of hostilities.

The American University. ELLERY C. STOWELL.

SHORTER NOTICES

Civilisation and the Growth of Law: a Study of the Relations between Men's Ideas about the Universe and the Institutions of Law and Government. By William A. Robson, Barrister-at-Law of Lincoln's Inn, Reader in Administrative Law in the University of London. (New York, Macmillan Company, 1935, pp. xv, 354, $2.50.) I do not see how the purpose of this brief and substantial book could be better presented than in the author's own words: "The object of this book is to depict the interactions between people's ideas about the universe on the one hand, and the laws and government of mankind on the other. I have endeavoured to show how legal and political institutions have been influenced by magic, superstition, religion and science; and how these great forces have in turn been influenced by the law." It is indispensable, at times, to break down the artificial barriers between special sciences, or rather departments. Modern physics, chemistry, mathematics are pointing the way to such a synthesis: an example which the sciences of the human spirit might very profitably follow. The usual objections to syntheses are their vagueness and their superficiality. Mr. Robson fully escapes the curse of vagueness; his book has one simple, extremely definite subject: What do we mean by the short word *Law?* He escapes also the curse of superficiality, because he limits himself, in all fields, to those essential facts upon which there is substantial agreement. It is not superficial to note that the earth turns: superficiality appears only when an author attempts to pose as a first-hand authority on all things knowable. This is the radical weakness of Spengler's work, and it invalidates much of Toynbee's. Perhaps the most novel part is the thesis that the notion of natural law was to a large extent borrowed from that of man-made law. Robson defines human law as "a pattern of conduct"—not a series of threats. It must be in general agreement with the mores; but even if it were the mere rationalization of the mores, it would, through definite expression, modify that which it seeks to express. Robson believes in the power of man, individually and collectively, by taking thought, to shape his destiny. He does not admit that we are "rooted in an unchangeable social mould". "[The] refusal", he concludes, "to recognize our ability to aim at the creation of whatever type of society we desire belongs to the old order of things. As such it is doomed to give way before a more hopeful attitude".

In attempting to appraise this thought-compelling book, I can only close as I began, with a pure and simple endorsement of the author's words: "When one has been closely preoccupied with contemporary studies and immediate practical problems for some years, the contemplation of long stretches of history and remote stages of human development brings an extraordinary sense of satisfaction and release."

Stanford University. ALBERT GUÉRARD, SR.

European Civilization: its Origin and Development. By Various Contributors. Under the direction of Edward Eyre. Volume I, *Prehistoric Man and Earliest Known Societies* [reissue]; volume II, *Rome and Christendom;* volume III, *The Middle Ages.* (New York, Oxford University Press, 1935, pp. vi, 844; viii, 696; 888, $8.75; $5.25; $6.25.) A half century ago Anatole France observed with regret that the fashion for writing general history seemed to be passing away. It is unfortunate that he did not live to witness the deluge that has been visited upon the present generation. The seven volume collaboration under the editorship of Professor Eyre will probably exceed five thousand pages. The object of the work is to give an account of the rise of Europe and to portray the distinctive character of European civilization. A conscious effort has been made to retell the story in the light of evidence garnered by the present generation of historical scholars.

The editor states that the responsibility of each author begins and ends with his own section, and that no attempt has been made to impose upon the work any unity of outlook beyond that common to all scholars. Consequently the reader who is looking for a broad, comprehensive synthesis will be disappointed, for there is much overlapping, and furthermore, far too much tedious detail. On the other hand, the scholar, although he may consult with profit the sections dealing with his particular field of interest, will more often than not find the discussion lacking documentation or other critical apparatus. In fact some contributors include no bibliography, while others furnish only a meager list of selected works.

The first volume contains an anthropological discussion by Wilhelm Schmidt upon the nature of primitive man and our methods of studying his behavior and culture. J. L. Myres treats the prehistoric cultures of Europe, the rise of higher civilization in the Ancient Near East, its transmission to Europe, and the origins and distribution of the various Indo-European speaking peoples.

The remainder of the volume is given to the history of the ancient world to the end of the Hellenistic period, while the prehistoric era in the West is deferred until the second volume. The principal subject of the latter is Rome. Among the contributors to the two are C. F. Jean, T. E. Peet, and A. W. Gomme. The volume on the Middle Ages is divided into four parts: "The Development of Medieval Europe", by D. C. Douglas; "The Religious Crisis in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries" and "The Later Middle Ages", both by Jean Guiraud; and "Ancient and Medieval Philosophy", by A. E. Taylor. This third volume contains, perhaps, less original material than the others, but it is better proportioned.

Princeton University. J. E. Pomfret.

Monuments and Men of Ancient Rome. By Grant Showerman, Profes-

sor of Classics in the University of Wisconsin. (New York, D. Appleton-Century Company, 1935, pp. xxii, 344, $5.00.) The late Professor Showerman has in this book made a last distinguished contribution to the literature devoted to popularizing the study of Roman antiquity. Replete with the delightful charm which in such high degree characterized all this author's writings, and sumptuously illustrated, the volume should be cordially welcomed by the lay reader.

Mr. Showerman first catalogues the greatest archaeological monuments of the Romans in Italy and the provinces. No mere catalogue, however, this is enlivened by interesting and illuminating comment. There follows some account of modern archaeological method and of its outstanding practitioners. A chapter on how Rome was buried will relieve its readers of the necessity of inquiring the explanation from newspapers, and furnish the latter better information than many papers seem to have available.

Of three chapters on Rome's excavation two contain an enthusiastic summary of the splendid results achieved under the archaeological program of the Fascist regime. A brief historical résumé of the works on topography and monuments from ancient times to the present concludes the quarter of the book devoted to the "monuments" of the title. The rest of the volume is concerned with "men".

Six chapters are given to the lives of Cicero and Caesar, and the monuments and scenes among which their careers were set. Effective use is made of quotation from Cicero's Letters, Suetonius, and Shakespeare. There are five chapters on Vergil, his life, his background, and the significance of his poems, their universal significance, their significance to readers of their own time and of our day. Four rather similar chapters on Horace follow. Both groups are excellent and stimulating reading. Of uneven value are the chapters on the emperors.

There are 160 pictures, beautifully reproduced, and sixteen maps and plans, eleven pages of annotations and fourteen of index. The publishers have provided attractive format and the volume is almost completely free of typographical error.

Western Reserve University. ROBERT SAMUEL ROGERS.

Stadt und Staat im römischen Italien: Untersuchungen über die Entwicklung des Munizipalwesens in der republikanischen Zeit. Von Hans Rudolph. (Leipzig, Dieterich, 1935, pp. vii, 257, 10 M.) Herr Rudolph explodes a bomb under the accepted presentation of the way in which republican Rome developed her municipal system in Italy. He submits the fragmentary evidence for the pre-Caesarian period to a thorough criticism and arrives at conclusions which, if novel, are logical and forceful. The Republic, he finds, did not take over for the communities which it subjected the forms of government that they had enjoyed while independent. Rather, it re-

garded them as absorbed into the Roman state and imposed officials whose competencies were minor and simply delegations from the magistrates at Rome. Neither the Social War, though caused by the injustice of this treatment, nor Sulla remedied the condition. In the Latin colonies, however, Rome from the beginning established a duumviral magistracy and council based on her own organization. This system Caesar extended throughout Italy by three major measures. The *lex agraria* of 59 B. C. distributed the remaining undivided public land in Italy; the *lex Mamilia Roscia Peducaea Alliena Fabia* of 55 B. C., which Rudolph distinguishes from the *lex Mamilia de limitibus* of 109 B. C., created for the newly settled areas duumviral governments; and the *lex Iulia municipalis* of 47 B. C. generalized this form but left to each community the task of adapting thereto its existing magistracies. Hence within the old quattuorvirate, octovirate, and aedilate two members thereafter stand out as possessing the superior prerogative of jurisdiction. For the significance of the reform lay in Rome's alienation in favor of the municipalities of the right of administering locally at least a minor jurisdiction. By this momentous step Caesar made the transition from the omnivorous city-state of the Republic to the congeries of self-governing units which, thanks to his assassination, was only gradually realized under the Empire.

The discussion naturally includes important considerations of relevant matters, such as the Latin dictators or the various types of municipal magistracies under the Republic, and of the surviving documents. The book marks a fundamental advance in the study of the problem but leaves a regret, nevertheless, that no such contemporary source as Cato's *Origines* has survived to cast light on the history of the Italian towns before their conquest by Rome.

Harvard University. MASON HAMMOND.

The Prefect of Egypt from Augustus to Diocletian. By Oscar William Reinmuth, Associate Professor of Classics, University of Nebraska. [Klio: Beiträge zur alten Geschichte.] (Leipzig, Dieterich, 1935, pp. xiv, 155, 9.50 M.) There is urgent need for studies organizing topically the undigested mass of material dealing with Greco-Roman Egypt. Dr. Reinmuth's monograph is of this nature, and its appearance as the first non-German member of the *Klio* Beiheft series is prima-facie evidence of its numerous merits. The work reveals an extraordinary command of inscriptional, papyrological, and literary sources bearing upon the subject, all combined into a penetrating treatment. Dr. Reinmuth calls his book "primarily a study in Roman provincial administration", and adds "Much of what is here presented is not new; but all of the material which is now available upon the prefect of Egypt is for the first time brought together". Actually this is an understatement, for although the exhaustive compilation has even unearthed

several unpublished papyri in different collections, the work is much more than an amassing of data; the writer's own observations make of it an indispensable introduction to the administration of Egypt in the first three centuries A. D.

Thirteen chapters discuss the prefect under the following heads: "Appointment, Position, and Powers"; "Officials Responsible to the Prefect"; "The Prefect and the Liturgies"; "Administrative Functions"; "System of Records"; "Edicts"; "Relation of the Prefect to the Emperor"; "Revenues"; "Administration of Justice"; "The Conventus"; "Civil Jurisdiction"; "Criminal Jurisdiction"; "Military Functions". There are, further, "Conclusions", appendixes listing the prefects and edicts of prefects, and the customary indexes.

Quite remarkable in a study of this kind is its readability. Both pedantry and polemic are conspicuously absent; the straightforward narrative flows easily and the voluminous references are usually relegated to the footnotes. Nonetheless, one regrets that the author has so conscientiously refrained from conjectures on texts and dating, for occasional minor matters might have been emended. A subsequent errata-sheet shows four entries worthy of repetition: p. 26, second last line, and p. 33, note 4—read *P. Oxy.* 4, 705 (199-200); p. 73, note 5—for Boak, *op. cit.*, read Schubart and Bell, *JEA* 13 (1927), 219-221; p. 139—after Flavius Valerius Pompeianus insert Aristius Optatus 16. Mar. 297. Boak, *Et. de Pap.* II (1933), no. 1.

Haverford College. HOWARD COMFORT.

Roman Mines in Europe. By Oliver Davies, Lecturer in Ancient History and Archaeology, Queens University, Belfast. (New York, Oxford University Press, 1935, pp. xii, 291, $10.00.) The timeworn adjectives indispensable and invaluable receive fresh life and strength when applied to this volume. It is the work of a man who is at home in the fields of archaeology and of mining. A "General Conspectus" begins with an inadequate treatment of the legal position and administrative organization (four pages), but closes with an excellent summary of mining and metallurgical techniques (47 pages). The remaining chapters present the record of wide research and careful investigation of actual remains. It is a book of reference, well documented and equipped with some useful sketches and plans, six maps, and a complete topographical index. The proportion may be gauged by the pages of certain chapters. Spain leads with 46 pages, Greece has 30 pages, and Britain 25. The map of Spain indicates 151 sites, of France and the Rhineland 196 sites, of Illyria, Macedonia, and Thrace 251 sites.

The prudent reader will approach this work with a dictionary, or glossary of mining terms. Thus fortified he will come to know and appreciate the words mispickel and hushing, and will learn that an adit is something more than an entrance to a mine. There are other surprises, by-products of

the author's search through slag heaps, tunnels, shafts, and stopes. The identification of *galena* as cupellated lead (p. 108, n. 6); of the *testarii* at Aljustrel as men engaged in cupellation (p. 39); the derivation of bronze from Brundisium (p. 72); and the determining factors in locating smelters, fuel (pp. 166, 169, 185), refractory clay (p. 166), fossil bones (p. 91), and coolness (p. 211); all of these are items of technical interest. But the general reader will be attracted by the digression on the Cassiterides (pp. 140-144) and the Etruscan connotation of Tarshish (pp. 67, 104, 111). There are many contributions to the history of pre-Roman mining in Europe, as well as the data for a history of the mining activities of the "Saxons" whom Davies believes were Roman workers enslaved by the Marcomanni (p. 201).

An awkward sentence (p. 115, n. 2) is excusable. But the establishment, on the doubtful authority of Diodorus, of the ruthless methods of the publicani in Spanish mines is not scientific. Nor does frequent repetition (pp. 108, n. 4, 226, 250) make the statement any more palatable. The author's modest preface introduces a work of unusual merit.

J. J. V.

Essays in Cornish History. By Charles Henderson. Edited by A. L. Rowse and M. I. Henderson. (New York, Oxford University Press, 1935, pp. xxiv, 240, $4.50.) The early history, topography, and place names of Cornwall, it is well known, present unusual difficulties which only the highly trained specialist may hope to overcome. Cornish local history is a subject which few have attempted, as a reference to Gross will quickly show. The young scholar to whom this volume is a memorial and of whose writings it is a selection, formed a plan for a parochial history of this interesting county and collected much material toward that end. He delivered many lectures and contributed many newspaper articles on phases of the Cornish scene which were of popular interest. He also assembled some data in brief form into what the editors term historical notes. Selections from these various types of his work constitute the bulk of the volume. There are only two chapters, both brief, which are classified as finished work of scholarship. But one of these bears documentation, although the other, a historical survey of Cornish woodlands, is of decided value for the derivation of place names. About a fourth of the volume consists of reprinted newspaper articles.

The historical sections are usually quite brief and marked by the lacunae which are inevitable in history done from local records. The portion which will perhaps be of most general interest is a note on the origin of Cornish towns. A longer note on the hundreds of Powder and Pydar will be useful and shows rare ability in dealing with place names. A short exposition of the rules of the cobbler's gild at Helston in 1517 and another note on the clergy of the diocese of Exeter at the Reformation will be of much more than local interest. There are also some fifteenth and sixteenth century

data from the court leet of the borough of Michell. The outstanding towns concerning which historical information is given are Truro, St. Ives, Fowey, and Lostwithiel. An account of the deanery of Buryan and of the church of Luxulyan afford examples of the kind of history this young man of great promise had set out to do on a large scale. The work affords a welcome addition to the meager stock of Cornish history. Its readers will greatly regret that the author was not spared to carry his work further.

The University of California. WILLIAM A. MORRIS.

Mediæval History: Europe from the Fourth to the Sixteenth Century. By Carl Stephenson, Professor of History, Cornell University. (New York, Harper and Brothers, 1935, pp. xviii, 797, $3.50.) Professor Stephenson's work provides an abundance of well-selected data carefully marshaled and delightfully written. Both the wealth of the material presented and its ordering may at times call for more intensive reading than an undergraduate, used to the discursive history teaching in the lower schools, may enjoy. But who will deny that in colleges students ought to be trained to do closer and more connected thinking based more generously on facts? If after a first perusal of the book the subject matter at times appears to be broken up and scattered, more careful study reveals in its procedure advantages that are worth winning. Not infrequently occur lucid summaries of movements culminating in important results, *e. g.*, the Roman Law through the Justinian Code (pp. 118-122) and the Greek Schism (pp. 323-326). Excellent delineations of the character of important personages enliven the narrative. The disagreeable task that confronts teachers of medieval history, eradicating what may be called "historical weeds", is most agreeably done, *e. g.*, Gregory VII no longer appears as a churchman thirsting for power, or the discovery of America as the result of the Renaissance, but as the consequence of the application of medieval science (p. 656). Happy thoughts in this connection are the prologue and the epilogue. We have not mentioned all the merits of the book; a word about some objections. We were neither impressed by the treatment of the great medieval hymns nor satisfied with the now far too common neglect of medieval culture east of the Rhine. Some loose statements occur: *e. g.*, is Mithraism known as Zoroastrianism (p. 20); were the differences between the Irish and Roman ecclesiastical establishments fundamentally antagonistic (p. 174); did St. Augustine hold that political institutions were the consequence of original sin (pp. 318-319); was the First Crusade "suddenly launched" (p. 320); did the Capetians begin with Louis VI a splendid dynastic career culminating in the gorgeous reign of Louis XIV (p. 369)? These and other items are, however, but "nods" in a long narrative that is always wide-awake and alert, yet moderate and cautious of statement. The genealogical and chronological tables at the end of the volume will prove very useful to students. Excellent plates are awk-

wardly placed, all together, in the middle of the book. Other illustrations, maps, plans, diagrams enhance its value.

Pennsylvania State College. F. J. TSCHAN.

Makers of Christianity from Alfred the Great to Schleiermacher. By John T. McNeill. (New York, Henry Holt and Company, 1935, pp. viii, 277, $2.00.) This book furnishes much material on both sides of the double question, Do men make history or does history make men? Without attempting a categorical answer, we can assert that through men we better understand history and through history we better understand men. Professor McNeill has made many of the characters whose careers and influence he has sketched come to life again, although it must be realized that some are too far gone for full success to come by the method of the modern historical pulmotor. The poet will be more successful than the historian in bringing to life from the remote past whenever mysticism has been an active element in shaping the interests of men and women; this will apply to not a few of the thirty characters selected for fuller treatment. This selection is admirable and by grouping the individuals according to the type of their chief interest, there is maintained the sense of continuity in the history as a whole. Dr. McNeill has shown himself something of a poet, as witness the themes of four successive chapters: "Brothers and Sisters of the Poor"; "The Glorious Company of the Teachers"; "The Noble Army of the Heretics"; "The Goodly Fellowship of the Reformers". It probably is not neglect, but a realization of a fact, that led to the omission of all representatives of Eastern Christianity. By the end of the ninth century that form of Christianity was already so definitely 'made' that for the millennium covered by this work, it contributes no outstanding personality to be considered a 'maker'. One might wish that more attention had been paid to the differentiation between sacramental and nonsacramental religion in the making of Christianity during this long period, for it is likely that questions in this area of interest will carry students in the near future into the examination of this phase of medieval religious life to a degree commensurate with the intensive research of a generation or two ago into the polity of the Church in the first two centuries.

The Library of Congress. WILLIAM H. ALLISON.

Curia Regis Rolls of the Reigns of Richard I. and John, preserved in the Public Record Office. Printed under the Superintendence of the Deputy Keeper of the Records. Volume VII, *15-16 John; Appendix, 7 Richard I-1 John.* (London, H. M. Stationery Office, 1935, pp. lviii, 484, £1 17*s.* 6*d.*) This volume completes the valuable series that has been appearing under the able editorship of Mr. C. T. Flower. The substantial record of five terms of the later years of King John is supplemented by certain remnants of

earlier time that have been overlooked in previous volumes. As such rolls are rarely dated, their chronological place must be determined by internal evidence, and membranes are discovered that have been misplaced in the final binding. Now and then there are allusions in the text to rolls that have been lost, and once mention is made of a "great roll" pertaining to attorneys and jurors. Organically the court is still the undivided curia, although a potential division between the justices of the bench at Westminster and those hearing pleas of the crown is visible. The advantage of a migratory court penetrating all parts of the country is offset by the endless difficulty of securing the attendance of suitors and jurors. The king being abroad at the time, there are very few instances of his intervention, although one case is reserved for his personal presence, and again a certain party claimed the right to appear only before the king or his chief justiciar. Incidentally, in the face of disturbing rumors about the king's personal safety, members of the royal household were sworn to report all persons announcing his death. The great bulk of the cases consists of civil pleas, especially possessory actions such as were begun under Henry II, with further definitions and refinements. Thus an action of novel disseizin would avail only against the actual disseizor, not his successor. Actions of darrein presentment encounter the growing claims of monasteries over parish churches. Manorial tenures and practices come frequently into litigation together with tests of villeinage. Criminal proceedings prove to be less extensive than might be expected, as they were likely to touch upon the liberties of local and private courts. Ordeals still survived, and wagers were allowed with restrictions, while the popularity of juries in spite of all deficiencies was increasing. A special interest is attached to all these proceedings which took place just before the reforms laid down in Magna Carta. An extensive list of all charters cited or recorded in the series, besides an ample index of persons and places as well as a splendid classification of subjects, completes the apparatus of the work.

Vassar College. J. F. Baldwin.

Statuta capitulorum generalium ordinis Cisterciensis, 1116-1786. Edidit D. Josephus-M[ia] Canivez. Tomus III, *1262-1400.* [Bibliothèque de la Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique.] (Louvain, Bureaux de la Revue, 1935, pp. xi, 758.) The third volume of the statutes of the Cistercians runs to considerably greater length than either of the first two, though it covers about the same number of years. There is one serious gap of ten years, at the time of the Great Schism, during which the General Chapter did not meet, apparently. The organization, procedure, and problems of the chapters remain about the same as in the earlier centuries (see *Am. Hist. Rev.*, XL, 724-726). During the first half of the fourteenth century many of the houses were in desperate straits financially, and this condition became worse after the out-

break of the Hundred Years' War. The General Chapters authorized the transfer of monks from the poorer to the richer houses (1343, p. 473); voted sums of money for the relief of houses sunk in debt (1344, p. 499); and even closed two houses and dispersed the monks (*ibid.*). There is some evidence, also, of increasing laxity in the observance of the rules of the order, during this period (pp. 454, 518, 538). During the period of the Schism the *studia generalia* of the order were practically deserted (1387, p. 555).

The volume before us will be found of unusual interest to the student of general history. In its pages we find references to the Crusade of Louis IX (pp. 60, 61, 92), the Council of Lyons (p. 129), and the Council of Vienne (pp. 332, 333, *et seq.*). The quarrel between Pope Boniface VIII and Philip IV receives attention (pp. 237, 260 ff.). The Hundred Years' War affected the Order in many important ways. In France its property was destroyed, and in England, sequestrated. In 1344 the king and queen of England and their children were included in the list of living persons for whom masses were to be sung, but not thereafter. These *Orationes pro vivis* are of considerable interest. For the pope, the cardinals, and the royal family of France three masses were to be sung by each priest of the order; for archbishops, bishops, the royal families of Spain, Portugal, Sicily, and Navarre, and the ducal family of Burgundy, two; for the counts of Flanders, Savoy, and Hainault, one (pp. 500-501, *et passim*). During the Great Schism the Cistercians sang masses for the Avignon pope only, of course (p. 566).

Boston University. WARREN O. AULT.

L'Angleterre catholique à la veille du schisme. Par Pierre Janelle, docteur ès lettres, chargé de cours à la Faculté des lettres de Clermont-Ferrand. (Paris, Gabriel Beauchesne et Fils, 1935, pp. 380, 60 fr.) The current Catholic explanation of the Reformation, as due to discontent over moral and financial abuses rather than to a loss of confidence in the Church's means of grace, is here applied to England and with better justice than to the Continent. The author demonstrates that one half of the books printed in England up to 1530 dealt with themes of Catholic piety, though complaint of ecclesiastical abuses was voiced coincidently. England fell unwittingly into schism and the process is well illustrated in the career of Stephen Gardiner, who was prepared to support the king in the matter of the divorce and the repudiation of papal authority without any thought of destroying the doctrinal structure or the unity of the Church. Kings and popes had quarreled before and forgiven each other. Henry by making a stiff stand would attain in the end a satisfactory compromise. There was no more reason to go to the block with More and Fisher than to the stake with Latimer and Ridley. When Gardiner discovered his mistake he was "the prisoner of his own past".

The intellectual defense of the schism looked for precedents if possible

on English soil, but Wycliffe and Occam were too radical. Marsilius of Padua better served the purpose and was done into English in 1535 with adaptations to the Henrician situation. The conciliar and democratic tendencies were definitely obviated. A note declared, "In all this longe tale he speaketh not of the rascall multytude, but of the parlyament". The evidence of the influence of Marsilius on the political theory of the Tudor schism was to me the most novel and interesting portion of this instructive and carefully documented work. I missed in the bibliography Oscar Albert Marti, *Economic Causes of the Reformation in England* (1929), and Richard Staines Arrowsmith, *The Prelude to the Reformation* (1923). G. R. Owst, *Literature and Pulpit in Medieval England* (1933) would have made it plain that the satire of the Reformation was in no sense an innovation.

Yale University. ROLAND H. BAINTON.

Le chancelier Antoine Duprat. Par Albert Buisson. Préface de M. Germain Martin, membre de l'Institut. (Paris, Librairie Hachette, 1935, pp. 383, 30 fr.) This is a significant and substantial life of a very able bourgeois politician, whom the author regards as one of France's forgotten heroes, the victim of a *légende malveillante*. Duprat was essentially a leader of the middle classes, in his day engaged in a determined attempt to end the disorders of the feudal regime. To achieve this goal he became an enthusiastic supporter and defender of the absolute king. As chancellor he did much to extend the royal authority, to promote mercantilism, and to create a strong and prosperous state. "His legal training helped him to work out the general ideas upon which rested the theory of the absolute monarchy. His bourgeois origin influenced him in his acceptance of the belief that the king was the state."

As a diplomat Duprat played an important role. Well equipped by temperament to participate in the incessant intrigue which dominated public life during the Renaissance, he maintained French interests in the struggles between Francis I and Charles V and "met the clever English diplomat, Cardinal Wolsey, on even terms".

Duprat also was an excellent financier. As chancellor he succeeded in improving the financial administration of the government. At the same time he greatly increased his personal fortune. Possessing "a profound respect for money" he became a cardinal and a papal legate in order to obtain the revenues "of certain archbishoprics and rich abbeys". In short, he seems to have been pretty much of a rugged individualist.

Mr. Buisson has written a scholarly as well as an entertaining book. Numerous footnotes indicate that he has used most of the printed works and a large part of the unpublished documents dealing with this subject. Moreover he has enhanced the value of the volume by inserting an appendix consisting of a genealogical table of the Duprat family and copies of a number

of important documents. The book also contains sixteen well-selected illustrations. An index should have been included.

The University of California. FRANKLIN C. PALM.

The Montagu Musters Book, 1602-1623. Edited with an Introduction by Joan Wake, and Biographical Notes by the Rev. H. Isham Longden, F. S. A. [The Northamptonshire Record Society, VII.] (Peterborough, Peterborough Press, 1935, pp. lxii, 289.) The musters book of Sir Edward Montagu, printed in this volume, deals with the militia or trained bands in the eastern half of Northamptonshire between 1602 and 1623. It is of interest for military history and for the long lists of names which it contains of the men selected to form the trained bands and of those required to supply money, horses, and equipment. But its chief value lies in its picture of local military administration. The Earl of Exeter, who was lord lieutenant, was rarely in the county and threw the burden of administering the musters upon his deputy lieutenants, drawn from the local gentry. As one of these deputies, Sir Edward Montagu was responsible for mustering and training the militia in five of the ten hundreds in the eastern division of the shire. His book contains his correspondence with other deputy lieutenants, with Exeter, with subordinate officials, and with other persons in the locality connected with the musters. His difficulties illustrate the insuperable weaknesses of a system in which the central government was attempting to raise an army without paying for it.

Miss Wake has performed her task with great, even meticulous, care. Indeed, some of the notes and cross references in her introduction might possibly have been omitted. A difficult editorial problem had to be solved because numerous letters in the musters book or extracts from them were already in print in the Montagu papers published by the Historical Manuscripts Commission, in the musters book of Sir Richard Knightley (Northamptonshire Record Society, III), and in the *Acts of the Privy Council.* Miss Wake has chosen to print the manuscript in full regardless of former publications. In most cases, I think, this procedure is fully justified; but occasionally her reprint of documents adds only microscopic detail.

The Rev. H. Isham Longden has added biographical notes of many of the figures mentioned in the text and Mr. C. Ffoulkes supplies a glossary of military terms.

The University of Minnesota. DAVID HARRIS WILLSON.

The Fortunes of Montaigne: a History of the Essays in France, 1580-1669. By Alan M. Boase. (London, Methuen and Company, 1935, pp. xl, 462, 18*s*.) This volume is a very full consideration of the influence of Montaigne's ideas on the *Grand Siècle.* The author has believed, quite rightly, that "much in the succeeding Age of Reason can hardly be seen in its true

light" without an understanding of Montaigne's influence during this time. Dr. Boase has confined his study to the years from 1580 to 1669, years when the *Essays* reappeared almost biennially. They were put on the Index in 1676; after that date, no new edition appeared in France for fifty-five years. Beginning with chapters on the contemporary reception of the *Essays,* the volume considers all the writers who may have been affected, favorably or unfavorably, by Montaigne. Two valuable chapters treat his influence on Pierre Charron, whose *La sagesse* greatly strengthened the power of Montaigne on subsequent readers. Full attention is given to J. P. Camus—to him, Montaigne was the *bréviaire des gentilshommes*—to Marandé, Descartes, La Mothe le Vayer, La Rochefoucauld, St. Evremont, Pascal, and Molière. The "Evolution of Taste" and *L'honnêteté* also have a place.

The volume confines itself, for the most part, to the effect of what Dr. Boase calls Montaigne's fideism, that is, "the affirmation that not even the most important dogmas of the Church, can be proved; they must be believed on faith, and, furthermore, it is dangerous to try to prove them". This position made it possible for Christians, sincere and insincere, to consider freely numerous matters outside the sphere of theology. It promoted a pessimistic Pyrrhonism and a moral optimism. The author believes that Montaigne was a sincere fideist, accepting as true the religion that he found in the country in which he happened to live. Readers of the *Essays* will never agree as to Montaigne's sincerity; certainly the essays "On Cannibals" and "The Apology for Raimond Sebond" would seem to give a basis for a fideism in Montaigne that may have been largely prudential. The external homage to conventional ideas was less necessary as time went on.

Efforts to show Montaigne's influence seem, at times, rather strained. "Echoes" of the *Essays* appear in numberless places, but it is possible that they may have been, at times, the result of a thorough knowledge of Seneca, Cicero, Plutarch, and others, which men like La Mothe le Vayer and St. Evremont, for example, certainly possessed. Insufficient credit, it seems to the writer, is given to the influence of Charron's *La sagesse;* it presented fideism in a much more orderly form than did the *Essays.* The discussion of Montaigne's influence on Molière, La Fontaine, and La Rochefoucauld, and the chapter devoted to *L'honnêteté* seem at times to strain the effort at finding "resemblances". Even though the volume may not always make out a clear case of influence, it is a valuable mine of information, carefully documented, and decidedly useful to students of the literature of the time and of the history of ideas.

The Ohio State University. HOWARD ROBINSON.

Robert Blake, sometime commanding all the Fleets and Naval Forces of England. By Roger Beadon. (London, Edward Arnold; New York, Longmans, Green and Company, 1935, pp. 308, $6.00.) This excellent,

masculine biography is in striking contrast to a few recent naval *Lives* written in the newer style. Serious, judicial, and undecorated, it is a fascinating narrative. Blake ranks next to Nelson, and before Nelson for a century and a half he ranked first among British naval officers. His dramatic career upon which depended such tremendous consequences presents an unusual biographical subject. The author justly concentrates on Blake's character, and on strategy, leaving tactics to the technicians to whom it belongs. His characterization is chiefly derived from official correspondence, for but few memoirs and private sources proved helpful. He gives three reasons for writing the book: the neglect of Blake by other writers, the importance of Blake's work as the chief architect of the Royal Navy, and the necessity of exposing the falsehoods of recent Royalist partisans who attribute to the Stuart kings "all the traditions of the fleet". One may add a fourth reason, the need of reappraising the career of this great officer in the light of new information. Blake was a very unusual phenomenon, a disinterested man who did not care for position, fame, or wealth; he was a Puritan whose watchword was duty. Severely wounded in battle, worn out in the service of his country, he died at sea, and was buried in Westminster Abbey. Regarded as unworthy of so sacred a sepulcher, his body after the Restoration was removed by the Royalists and interred elsewhere.

Carnegie Institution of Washington. CHARLES O. PAULLIN.

Onze Ijslandsvaarders in de 17de en 18de Eeuw: Bijdrage tot de Geschiedenis van de Nederlandsche Handel en Visscherij. Door Marie Simon Thomas. (Amsterdam, Enum, 1935, pp. xxxvi, 320.) Although this book is officially called a doctoral dissertation, it is more comprehensive and authentic than many works written by experienced professors; while at the same time it is much more interesting than the average dissertation. The illustrations are both profuse and beautiful. The research work done by the author must have taken several years, and it is apparent that Miss Thomas has mastered not only the Danish tongue but also the language of Iceland.

With exemplary modesty Dr. Thomas refers to the labors of earlier writers on Iceland and its history. Consequently, instead of repeating the accounts to be found in other secondary sources, the writer plunged forthwith into those phases that have hitherto been almost totally neglected. This led to the study of hundreds of unpublished documents in the archives of The Hague, Amsterdam, and the lesser Dutch ports of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries; of Copenhagen, Stockholm, and Reykjavik besides. Magazine and newspaper articles were likewise carefully consulted. The bibliography, therefore, although not especially long in number of pages, is excellent and seemingly complete. The same may be said of the documentation.

We gather from this study that the Dutch Republic treated the colonies

of Denmark in much the same fashion as those of Portugal and Spain. Notwithstanding the monopoly of the trade with Iceland declared by the government of Denmark in the year 1602 and officially maintained until 1787, a large number of Dutch vessels evaded the scrutiny of the Danish officials. The privilege granted by the king of Denmark to the city of Amsterdam in the year 1490 encouraged Dutch merchants at a time when the trade in falcons caught in Iceland was still lucrative. And once having opened up profitable relations with the native population on the island, the Dutch merchants continued to seek new outlets for commerce regardless of the changed attitude on the part of the Danish king. The extensive fishing operations and the search for whales brought many a Dutch vessel to the shores of Iceland.

Carefully piecing together the thousands of bits of information to be found in documents and manuscripts, the author has produced the first real history of the Dutch trade with Iceland, and has also thrown a great deal of new light on the commerce of Denmark itself. Further information may be gathered from the thirteen appendixes, while the five indexes are an eloquent witness of the thoroughness with which the writer commenced and finished a difficult task.

The University of Michigan. A. Hyma.

Ottoman Statecraft: the Book of Counsel for Vezirs and Governors of Sari Meḥmed Pasha, the Defterdār. Turkish Text with Introduction, Translation, and Notes by Walter Livingston Wright, jr., Assistant Professor of History in Princeton University. [Princeton Oriental Texts, Volume II.] (Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1935, pp. xv, 172, 63 v., $3.50.) Dr. Wright, who has become president of the two American colleges in Istanbul, provides in this book most helpful services to historians of Turkey and students of political institutions. Defterdar Sari Meḥmed distilled out of some forty-five years of government service, supplemented by study of previous Oriental writings on the art of government (such as the *Kudatku Bilik*, the *Siyaset Nameh*, the *Quabus Nameh*, and the works of Lutfi Pasha, Qochi Bey, and Hajji Khalīfa—pp. 18-20) a treatise designed to remove colossal abuses and restore happier conditions of earlier days. Dr. Wright, using five available manuscripts, for the first time prints and translates the "Book of Counsel", contributing much through a masterly introduction and illuminating notes. The whole provides a clear and detailed picture of Turkey about the year 1700, emphasizing the political situation, but allowing glimpses of economic and ecclesiastical conditions. The able and conscientious treasurer is shown as lamenting "the passing of that mighty machine of government which had been built up by his predecessors to enable an autocrat to rule a vast empire which lacked racial, geographical, or religious coherence and could be held together only by the over-

powering force of a political system which was ruled by a single will and an administration which was also an army" (p. 28).

Since Sari Meḥmed was near to becoming grand vizier, a leading motive in writing may have been to prepare through study and reflection a program for his own guidance when in that high and perilous position. His book may have been published as a species of political "platform", in which case its obvious attack upon abuses and illegal privileges no doubt influenced interested parties toward pursuing the author to his tragic end (pp. 11, 12). He did not, be it said, propose innovations such as might be called constitutional changes. Forward looking ideas of reform did not enter the minds of Turkish statesmen (with the possible exception of the third Kiuprili) for several generations to come.

A correction may be suggested of the statement that the Janissaries in Sari Meḥmed's time numbered 96,727 (p. 40), since a careful reading of the text (pp. 103, 104) shows that only 53,200 were Janissaries, whether in active service near the Sultan, in garrison in the provinces, or on pension; 17,133 were regular cavalry (Spahis of the Porte) and the remainder were such as guards, gardeners, gatemen, cooks, shipbuilders, and palace officials, students, and servants.

The University of Illinois. A. H. Lybyer.

The London Mason in the Seventeenth Century. By Douglas Knoop, Professor of Economics in the University of Sheffield, and G. P. Jones, Lecturer in Economic History in the University of Sheffield. (Manchester, Manchester University Press, 1935, pp. 92, 5*s*.) This volume continues the story told in *The Mediæval Mason* (*Am. Hist. Rev.*, XL, 109-110). Its authors are still harassed by the lack of material, but have wielded chisel and hammer skillfully on such stone as they could find, and the result is a clear-cut, well-proportioned piece of historical masonry. Their subject is London, rapidly growing metropolis, home of rich merchants, nobles, and gentry, and victim of the Great Fire of 1666. Their period is one in which Gothic has given place to Renaissance and classical architecture. The great building projects are no longer castles or royal palaces, but the houses of aristocrat or rich bourgeois and the replacing of the 13,000 dwellings and eighty-nine churches destroyed by the fire. A new breed of architects emerges, led by men like Inigo Jones and Christopher Wren, and a new class of mason-contractors takes charge of an industry that had formerly used the "direct labor" system.

To many readers the most interesting parts of the book will be those dealing with the erection of St. Paul's Cathedral. Most of the £750,000 spent on that edifice was obtained by levying a duty on coal brought into London. Of this sum, at least a third was paid for stone and masons' work. The stone was brought from Portland by sea and from Oxfordshire by river. The construction was done by nine firms; one firm spent thirty-three years

on the job, each of four firms was responsible for a quarter of the dome, and each of the two western towers was build by a different contractor. Some of the contractors had begun as makers of tombs or statuary, some had risen from small beginnings, but the important firms (especially that of the Strong brothers) sprang from Oxfordshire stone-quarrying. "About four-fifths of all masonry contracting work at St. Paul's was carried out by contractors of country origin and training" (p. 48). The contractor might employ as few as a dozen or as many as seventy masons, paying them about two shillings, sixpence a day. In theory he was to receive payment for his work in advance or in frequent installments; but in practice payments often fell into arrears, and he had to borrow from a bank, leave his creditors and workmen unpaid, or draw on his own capital. Only a rich contractor could afford to wait long for his money, and only a high price could allow him to recoup himself for delays and bad debts. He took risks which sometimes ruined him, but sometimes he became a very rich man.

The book describes the not very successful efforts of the London Masons' Company to prevent false workmanship and to preserve the monopoly of trade in the city. It also examines the conditions of wage earners and of apprentices. Any lingering belief that all apprentices passed on to become freemen is shattered by the discovery that only forty-four per cent of the youths indentured between 1620 and 1690 were admitted to the freedom.

The University of Minnesota. HERBERT HEATON.

La censure dans les Pays-Bas autrichiens. Par André Puttemans, docteur en philosophie et lettres, professeur à l'Athénée royal de Forest. [Extrait des *Mémoires* publiés par l'Académie royale de Belgique.] (Brussels, Georges van Campenhout, 1935, pp. 374, 40 fr.) The censorship of the press reflects the intellectual, literary, religious, institutional, and political conditions of society. Nothing can be more instructive than its history, especially when it is as thoroughly studied and as clearly expounded as it has been by Dr. Puttemans. The censorship arose in the Netherlands early in the sixteenth century as a measure of defense against Lutheranism. When Lutheranism had been conquered in the Southern Provinces, the archducal government turned its attention chiefly to Jansenism. In the eighteenth century, which is the special subject of the book under review, the government employed the curb on books to fight both rationalism and ultramontanism. Among the numerous works banned at this time were the writings of the Jansenists, Quietists, Gallicans, and Febronians, as well as those of Erasmus, Bayle, Hobbes, Puffendorf, Grotius, Bodin, Machiavelli, Mallebranche, Scudéry, Le Sage, Boccaccio, La Fontaine, Marot, Scarron, Leibniz, and Spinoza—in short, as the author sums it up, "the most illustrious historians, jurists, philosophers, and poets of the age". Keeping or selling such books was made a capital crime. Until the French Revolution only one work of

Voltaire—the *Essai sur les moeurs*—and one of Rousseau—the *Émile*—were forbidden. Voltaire's plays were frequently performed with the government license. When the French Revolution broke out, the Austrian rulers of the Belgian Netherlands attempted to exclude all republican propaganda. With the triumph of the revolutionary party, in 1794, freedom of the press was proclaimed, and was incorporated among the fundamental laws promulgated in 1814 and 1815. Since that time complete freedom of expression has prevailed except during the years of the Great War.

Cornell University. PRESERVED SMITH.

An Introduction to the Documents relating to the International Status of Gibraltar, 1704-1934. By Wilbur C. Abbott. [Bureau of International Research, Harvard University and Radcliffe College.] (New York, Macmillan Company, 1934, pp. vi, 112, $2.50.) In his able introduction of seventeen pages the author reminds us that Gibraltar stands as the "symbol of sovereignty", and that many of the British people feel that "its loss would mean the end of the British Empire". England, however, manifested little interest in it until the days of Cromwell, and its capture half a century later was an afterthought rather than the result of any premeditation. Despite its historical importance, Gibraltar has no satisfactory history, and one based upon an examination of all the basic authorities is badly needed. Even its capture by England and the battle of Velez-Malaga have never been thoroughly studied in the light of the source materials in British archives.

The present work is, indeed, the first serious attempt to provide a bibliography for a history of Gibraltar. The introduction is all too brief, but leaves the reader with the hope that Professor Abbott may himself sometime attempt a full-length history of this stronghold. The bibliography is arranged chronologically from 1540 to 1933, but only six items are earlier than 1704. Six pages are devoted to listing the Parliamentary Papers from 1831 to 1916. Similar space is given to a list of unpublished manuscripts in the Public Record Office which might be somewhat extended by including the Admiralty records. The work, with its convenient organization and excellent index, will be a great boon to anyone who desires to study the history of Gibraltar.

Indiana University. WILLIAM THOMAS MORGAN.

Le problème du paupérisme en Belgique à la fin de l'ancien régime. Par Paul Bonenfant, archiviste de l'assistance publique de Bruxelles, chargé de cours à l'Université libre. [Extrait des *Mémoires* publiés par l'Académie royale de Belgique.] (Brussels, Librairie Falk Fils, 1934, pp. 579.) This is an excellent study in the field of social history. It is essentially a pioneer work, for thus far only in local monographs or the fragmentary accounts of general works has any attempt been made to deal with the subject. The

author was both well qualified and advantageously situated for his task. On some points he has purposely gone into considerable detail and, due to the inaccessibility of much of his material, has quoted generously from the sources in his footnotes. The volume is divided into two parts, of which the first is devoted to a discussion of the causes and principal characteristics of the problem and attempted reforms to 1770. In this period legislative measures and relief institutions alike proved insufficient. The second part deals with reforms from 1770 to 1789. The date 1770 is taken as the central point of the work chiefly because it marks a new governmental attitude toward pauperism.

With the ministry of Starhemberg (1770-1783) comes a revival of interest in the problem and the establishment of houses of correction (*maisons de force*). These institutions were attacked on both economic and humanitarian grounds. To relieve the situation and especially to remove the penal element from poor relief, certain local welfare associations (*aumônes générales*) were set up. These associations were not successful, chiefly because of the lack of financial resources and a central authority to co-ordinate their efforts. They also failed to make adequate provision for the education of children and the care of the sick. From 1783 to 1789 the problem is presented from the larger point of view of the imperial relief program of Joseph II. This included a rather comprehensive plan for the care of the sick with general hospitals and clinics, maternity and childrens hospitals, and insane asylums. The operation of the plan in the Low Countries was complicated by the suppression of "useless" convents and brotherhoods with the result that a conflict developed between the government and the estates. A compromise was eventually reached upon the basis of the application of part of the funds of the Church to relief purposes. This led to the beginnings of an efficient medical service for the poor. There is no classified bibliography, but a short list of archives, libraries, and general collections in which material has been found. A partial compensation for the omission of an index is the detailed table of contents.

The State University of Iowa. GEORGE GORDON ANDREWS.

L'École mystique de Lyon, 1776-1847. Par Joseph Buche, agrégé de l'Université, secrétaire général de l'Académie des sciences, belles-lettres et arts de Lyon. Préface de M. Edouard Herriot. (Paris, Félix Alcan, 1935, pp. xi, 306, 25 fr.) In this work, to which a preface has been contributed by M. Herriot, we have an important chapter in the history of the idea of progress, strangely enough bound up with a local mystical cult, *L'École mystique de Lyon,* which was destined to influence both politics and historiography, and to give in social palingenesis, what might be called a Western apocalyptic eschatology, by means of which Ballanche sought to bridge the gulf between the Christian religion and the Enlightenment (pp. 200-201).

The author shows an intimate knowledge of the vast range of the period, as well as of the manuscript remains of Ballanche and of his *côterie littéraire,* which are very widespread. The result of his work is to explain certain reactions against the Revolution of 1789. In his opening chapters, when he traces the ancestry and early life of Ballanche, until his seventeenth year (1776-1793), he brings out the important fact that in Lyons, as in other places in the provinces, Napoleon appeared as a deliverer. The siege of Lyons, and the ensuing atrocities left a permanent mark on Ballanche, who came under the influence of the Freemasonry of Martin, of which one lodge was the home of the mystical speculations, the fruit of which he ultimately embodied in his *Antigone.*

Buche then proceeds to the examination of the literary problem of the relations between Ballanche and Chateaubriand, whose work, *Le génie du Christianisme,* he proves to be indebted to Ballanche. He also discloses a source of Victor Hugo's *Les Misérables* in Ballanche's manuscript of the bishop.

Behind the whole philosophy of Ballanche lies the thesis that 'misfortune is the privilege of the man of genius'. In this simple formula, he finds the basis of reconciling Christianity, classical paganism, and the misfortunes of Napoleon, who becomes the Oedipus of his *Antigone.* In chapters XI-XIII, the author analyzes this work together with the *Essai sur les institutions* and *L'Homme sans nom,* with great insight, concluding the book with a survey of the range of influence exerted by Ballanche in the closing years of his life.

M. Buche has given an honest and interesting survey of the literary and philosophical life in the years following the outbreak of the Revolution, and he has shown one of the main forms of metamorphosis of *l'Illumination* after the disillusionment produced by the Girondin excesses. An element of civic pride does not detract from the permanent value of the work, which provides the explanation of several points of view seen in the French historians of the nineteenth century.

Oberlin School of Theology. F. W. Buckler.

Lettres inédites de Napoléon I^er^ à Marie-Louise, écrites de 1810 à 1814. Avec introduction et notes par Louis Madelin, de l'Académie française. [Bibliothèque nationale.] (Paris, Éditions des Bibliothèques Nationales de France, 1935, pp. xxxix, 270, 25 fr.) These 318 letters from Napoleon to Marie Louise—previously only eight were known—belong among the most significant documents that reveal the man Napoleon. Aside from his letters to Josephine and some youthful writings, these are practically the sole autograph remains of the emperor and the only ones for his later years. To the casual reader, it is true, they will seem arid and monotonous. To the student, familiar with the emperor's career, they are illuminating because he

understands when and how Napoleon is revealing his immediate and genuine reaction to the extraordinary events in the midst of which he was writing. The letters vary in length from twenty words to four hundred, but most of them contain from seventy to one hundred words. The style is as laconic as a telegram.

Tender messages to his wife and thoughts for his son are rarely omitted. For both he is always considerate and solicitous even at the most crucial moments. Chivalrous endearments are not lacking. Occasionally the brevity of style makes his requests seem dictatorial. Sometimes he corrects or advises her in a kindly way. Only once or twice, as in letters 282 and 283, does he seem to show irritation, and for that he apologized in 285. Usually he reports that his health is good; two or three times he mentions having a cold; infrequently he admits fatigue, though his letters are often written in the night hours. For political as well as personal reasons he rarely betrays his misfortunes and trials. The phrases, "Mes affaires vont bien", or "Mes affaires vont assez bien", occur frequently, sometimes at most unexpected moments. Comments on the weather often appear. Reports of military and political affairs abound. The letters heralding the battles of Borodino, Dresden, and Champaubert, for instance, are precious, as are the first impressions of Moscow. In general, the letters of 1814 are the most dramatic; those following the entrance of the Allies into Paris are poignant: "Je souffre de ce que tu dois souffrir." Altogether, the letters heighten one's opinion of the character of Napoleon but not of Marie Louise.

These letters were preserved by the Montenuovo family, descendants of Marie Louise and Count Neipperg, and their offer of them for sale in 1934 was the first news that they were still in existence. They were purchased by the French government and deposited in the Bibliothèque nationale. Only a single letter of Marie Louise to Napoleon is known to exist. The present edition is admirably annotated (the notes to letters 307 and 310 through some oversight have not been harmonized) and indexed and has a valuable introduction. There are two editions in English translation of the letters as edited by M. Charles de La Roncière.

Wesleyan University. GEORGE MATTHEW DUTCHER.

Die Heilige Allianz: Tragik eines europäischen Friedensbundes. Von Wilhelm Schwarz. (Stuttgart, J. G. Cotta'sche Buchhandlung, 1935, pp. x, 383, 5 M.) The author has selected as a subject for investigation the years from 1813 to 1826. In spite of his assertion to the contrary there has been much excellent historical writing on this period of European history during the last half century. In 1887 E. Muhlenbeck studied in *Études sur les origines de la Sainte Alliance* the spiritual background of Baroness von Krüdener. Seven years later Stern's *Geschichte Europas* began to appear. In 1912 Grand Duke Nicolas Mikhailovich threw much light on the period

in his biography of Alexander I. Two years later the lectures of W. A. Phillips on *The Confederation of Europe* were first printed. In 1922 W. P. Cresson published on the basis of certain materials gleaned in Russian archives *The Holy Alliance*. Three years afterward appeared the histories of the foreign policies of Castlereagh and Canning of Professors Webster and Temperley and the biography of Metternich by Srbik. In spite of this rather large amount of writing on the period, however, the Russian and Spanish archives apparently are still to be fully explored and historians still hold divergent views concerning the significance of events.

The interest of the present work lies mainly in its interpretations of these years. Far from accepting the oft quoted declarations of Metternich and Castlereagh, which characterized the Holy Alliance as a "sonorous nothing" and "a piece of sublime mysticism and nonsense", the author goes beyond contemporary liberals even and intimately connects this agreement with nearly every development of foreign and domestic politics. He attributes the origin of the idea to the influence of a coterie of women belonging to the Russian court, who were in touch with the Baroness von Krüdener, and, in contrast to Phillips, puts no emphasis on the instructions to Novosiltsov of September 11, 1804. In the greater part of the book the author traces the efforts of Alexander to transform the religious document of the Holy Alliance into an instrument of practical political action. They achieved a temporary and only partial success after Metternich became alarmed over the outbreak of revolution in Italy. The ideal of a Holy Alliance, of course, broke down under the strain of the tension caused by the Greek revolt and opposition of Canning. The author knows the printed sources thoroughly but gives no evidence of having explored untouched archival material. In presenting his interpretation of the period he has sketched many revealing pen pictures and coined numerous striking phrases.

The University of Wisconsin. C. P. Higby.

Κοινοβουλευτικὴ Ἱστυρία τῆς Ἑλλάδος [Parliamentary History of Greece]. By Demetrios A. Petrakakos. Volume I, *1453-1843*. (Athens, Demetrakos, 1935, pp. xv, 508, 500 drs.) This history was undertaken in consequence of a vote of the Greek parliament in 1934 during the premiership of M. Tsaldares, to whom it is dedicated. The author, an ex-deputy who studied in Germany, has unfortunately produced a compilation rather than an orderly narrative. He displays great erudition, much of it in enormous footnotes, his long prolegomena fill sixty-eight pages, followed by a "General Introduction" of ninety-five more, dealing with Rhegas and his political ideas and including a chapter on British parliamentarism in the time of Cromwell, and it is not till page 199 that the narrative really begins and is then printed in three kinds of type. The "first book", entitled "Liberties under Slavery", describes the ecclesiastical and municipal institutions

of the Greeks under Turkish rule—the privileged position of the Œcumenical Patriarch, then the "Head of the Nation", and the elected "elders of the people", the *demogérontes* of Athens, of whom M. Kampouroglous, the eminent historian of the Athenians in the Turkish times, has given such an admirable account. The "second book" contains the "democratic revolution" of 1821, of which the writer rejects the official date of March 25, now recognized as Greek Independence Day, maintaining that the War of Independence really began on March 23, when his compatriots, the Maïnates, took Kalamata. Anyhow, the Messenian Senate was the first parliamentary body of Modern Greece, and its first constitution that of Epidauros. The "third book" comprises the movements in favor of offering the Greek throne to Jerome Bonaparte and the Duc de Nemours, afterward a candidate for the Belgian crown, and the constitution of Troizen, with a digression on Jeremy Bentham's correspondence in 1824 with Maurokordatos in whom the philosopher saw "the destined chief of the Republic". But prophecies about Greek politics are always unsafe, and it has been said that no philosopher has ever invented a durable form of government for Greece. Of special interest are the allusions to Byron's "typographical colonel", Leicester Stanhope, and the *Hellenika Chroniká* of Mesolonghi, of which the Finlay Library possesses a unique example with the missing No. 20, which Byron forbade to be printed because of an article in favor of Hungary. The "fourth book" is entitled the "Dictatorship of Capo d'Istria"; the fifth and last of this volume is called the "Absolute Monarchy of Otho", which was ended by the September revolution of 1843, and which has lately been described by a well-known Greek diplomatist, M. Pipineles. The volume is based on wide study of the national archives, supplemented by researches in those of the British foreign office, and is illustrated by 205 plates.

Athens. WILLIAM MILLER.

Bombay in the Days of George IV: Memoirs of Sir Edward West. By F. Dawtrey Drewitt. [Second Edition, revised and enlarged with hitherto unpublished documents.] (London; New York, Longmans, Green and Company, 1935, pp. xviii, 342, $5.00.) The history of the king's courts of justice established in India during the latter part of the eighteenth century, has usually been written by their opponents. Sir Edward West, the last recorder and the first chief justice of the court at Bombay, has long been known as a political economist, but his judicial career was almost entirely ignored until the publication of these memoirs in 1907. Dr. Drewitt is a grandson of Sir Edward's sister, Mrs. Lane. Some of the letters written to Mrs. Lane are reproduced, but the heart of the book is Lady West's diary, which gives a vivid account of social life in Bombay during the period from 1823 to 1828. The new edition has been revised and somewhat enlarged, the chief addition being some letters from Archdeacon Barnes relating to Bishop Heber's visit to Bombay in 1824.

It is a tragic story. The real trouble, however, was not the conflict between the royal judges and the officials of the Chartered Company, but the losing battle which all of these British exiles had to wage against the deadly climate of India. "With no Simla as a refuge, without railways, without quinine, without ice, there could have been little relief from the heat, the sickness, the dull stifling monotony of the land." The king's judges sent to Bombay between 1799 and 1828 were all in the prime of life, but Sir James Mackintosh, who had the good sense to resign, was the only one who lived to return to England. The average life of the others in India was less than four years. Sir Edward and Lady West both died in 1828. From the political point of view, Dr. Drewitt's main thesis is that the king's courts upheld the great tradition of British justice against the opposition of a grasping corporation and blazed the trail for the reforms of Lord William Bentinck which saved the Company from dissolution in 1833. The book is worth reading for its picture of social life in old Bombay as well as for the light that it throws on the institutional history of India.

Bryn Mawr College. WILLIAM ROY SMITH.

Early Constitutional Development in Australia. By A. C. V. Melbourne. Volume I, *New South Wales, 1788-1856.* (New York, Oxford University Press, 1934, pp. viii, 456, $8.50.)

Governor Arthur's Convict System, Van Diemen's Land, 1824-1836: a Study in Colonization. By William Douglass Forsyth. [Royal Empire Society Imperial Studies, General Editor, Arthur Percival Newton.] (London; New York, Longmans, Green and Company, 1935, pp. xv, 213, $3.00.) Professor Melbourne's book is the first of a series of three in which he plans to cover the early constitutional development of the Australian colonies. This volume on New South Wales has been divided into five parts, each culminating in legislation marking a stage in the evolution to responsible government from an autocratic regime previously unknown among British colonies. In the case of each cautious alteration the author is careful to reveal not merely the changes in the blueprint but, more interestingly, the actual working out of that particular alteration amid the circumstances and the personalities of New South Wales.

Factors tending to delay changes are made clear. One sees that one cannot hold accountable only the inert patience of a colonial office willing to endure again in the nineteenth century arguments which the eighteenth century had exhausted, nor can one often lay the blame upon doctrinaire desk men composing theoretical systems for the antipodes. It is made to seem natural enough that London should have sought for a time to confine the colony to its original penal purposes, and that later officialdom should have doubted the feasibility of maintaining the imperial connection if responsible government were conceded. Nearly as hampering as attitudes in London were those in Australia. The author lays particular emphasis upon

the forty-year struggle between "emancipists" and "exclusives" which was followed by their suspect alliance in opposition to adjustments toward political or economic democracy. Sectionalism as well contributed to confuse the issues. It is pleasant to have so scholarly a constitutional history made so readable, but the reviewer was occasionally surprised at what seems a ruthless labeling of motives.

Mr. Forsyth's study of the convict system in Van Diemen's Land concerns one of the most important proving grounds for British penal colonization at a critical period in the history of the experiment. The organization of the system, the status of the "slaves", and the position of the settlers as amateur jailers, are contrasted with the purposes of convict colonization and the adverse judgments of such bodies as the Select Committee of 1838. The author concurs in a verdict that transportation did not lessen crime in England, that it punished criminals only capriciously, that it worked no deep reformation within the convicted while it degraded the free settlers—and this in spite of Governor Arthur's unusual ability and devotion to duty.

St. Louis. JEAN INGRAM BROOKES.

A Critical Study of the First Anglo-Chinese War, with Documents. By P. C. Kuo, Professor of History, National Wuhan University, China. (Shanghai, Commercial Press, 1935, pp. 315, $3.00.) Laboring in an already well-worked field, Dr. Kuo has brought to the study of the first Anglo-Chinese war a sound historical training and has produced a worthy contribution to the body of historical scholarship. Not only has he used with critical discrimination the available sources and secondary works in English, including the somewhat limited fund of Chinese decrees and memorials to which earlier writers had access, but he has also delved deeply into that voluminous mass of Chinese source material which, locked in the mold of an unfamiliar language or in the archives of an uncommunicative government, long remained unavailable to the Western historian.

Of the three principal collections of Chinese material utilized by the author, two—*The Political Works of Lin Tsê-hsu,* and the *Tung Hua Lu* or *Annals of the Reigning Dynasty*—have long been in print, but the third—*Ch'ou Pan Yi Wu Shih Mo* (*The Beginning and End of the Management of Barbarian Affairs*)—remained in manuscript in the Palace Museum at Peiping until 1930. In addition to the decrees, memorials, and communications cited from various sources in the body of his text, he gives us, in an appendix, his translations of fifty-six selected documents from this third important collection.

Kuo's conclusions with regard to the broad aspects of the conflict are in substantial accord with those of earlier authorities. Differences appear not in the lines of the picture but rather in its atmospheric perspective. Thus, after discussing the drastic solution of the opium question by Commissioner Lin, he observes (p. 196): "Before things reached this stage there were not

lacking farsighted persons who groped for a peaceful solution. In this respect the British were far behind the Chinese . . . the British government had all along followed a policy of drift, and its officers in the field never endeavored to seek any serious remedy for the growing evil. The Chinese statesmen, on the other hand, made various proposals attacking the question from different angles."

From this and from various other moderately stated conclusions there may be some dissent; there should be little difference of opinion, however, as to the real service rendered by the author in having made available the material upon which his conclusions are based. Future developments in the field of Chinese history depend upon the research work of those capable of redressing the past unequal balance between Chinese and Western documentation. Dr. Kuo, in the volume under review, shows himself a valuable recruit to this growing band of workers.

Simmons College. G. Nye Steiger.

The Making of Modern Iraq: a Product of World Forces. By Henry A. Foster. (Norman, University of Oklahoma Press, 1935, pp. ix, 319, $4.00.) The history of Iraq is one of the interesting chapters of post-World War developments. British imperialism and Arab nationalism, oil interests, and the new idea of League of Nations mandates co-operated or conflicted to create present-day Iraq. The story of those fifteen years has been told in official documents and in unofficial narratives. Dr. Foster presents in his book a detailed story of the mandate administration in Iraq, drawn largely from official documents. The book will certainly be used with advantage by all those interested in the postwar history of the Near East. It contains much and useful material, but it does not seem to the reviewer always lucidly arranged, so that the conflict of "world forces" of which modern Iraq is a product is not always clearly discernible or analyzed. The book is well written and the author who has probably spent a long time in the preparation of his study will be easily excused for a slight overestimation of the importance of his subject when he concludes: "Iraq is the first offspring of the avowed principle of the sacred trust of civilisation, begotten under a world compact and in concerted action. In any case her conception, birth, training, and release to the freedom of the social order, place upon the whole of society, not merely Great Britain, nor Iraq, nor even the League of Nations, responsibility involving the perpetuity of civilisation itself. It is a test of humanity." This concluding sentence sums up the point of view of the author and his way of presentation. The book contains four excellent maps.

Smith College. Hans Kohn.

The French Parliamentary Committee System. By R. K. Gooch, Professor of Political Science in the University of Virginia. [The Institute for Re-

search in the Social Sciences, University of Virginia.] (New York, D. Appleton-Century Company, 1935, pp. xiv, 259, $2.75.) Even the most casual political observer must realize that the very existence of democratic government is seriously threatened at the present time. The World War seems to have made the world more safe for dictatorship than for democracies. Under these circumstances it is only natural for students of government to turn their attention to the problems of democratic government and to try to assist in their solution.

Of the three great democratic nations which have withstood every attack upon their systems of government, France is perhaps in the most serious position. Democracy in both Great Britain and the United States has been a slow development based upon trial and experience. Democracy in France is practically a product of the Third Republic, and the monarchical element in the electorate is still a very vociferous minority. For that reason, the French variant of democratic government deserves particular attention at this time. The downfall of democracy in France would mean the destruction of the democratic system of government except for the Anglo-Saxon nations.

Professor Gooch has found that the grand committee system is the fundamental source of power and control in the French parliamentary system. These great permanent committees of the Chamber of Deputies and the Senate control to a large extent the making of laws, the administration of finance, and the executive itself. In fact, perhaps the greatest weakness of the French system is the subordination of the executive to the parliament which means in practice the government's subjection to the grand committees. Professor Gooch would support former President Doumergue's demand that the power of dissolution be given to the government as a natural solution of the problem of reform within the parliamentary system.

Professor Gooch has subjected the whole system to a searching analysis and his very scholarly and objective treatment makes his conclusions the more valuable. The monograph is both timely and of permanent value to the student of comparative government and to all those interested in the peaceful and successful evolution of democracy.

Stanford University. GRAHAM H. STUART.

Out of my Past: the Memoirs of Count Kokovtsov. Edited by H. H. Fisher. Translated by Laura Matveev. [Hoover War Library Publications, No. 6.] (Stanford University, University Press, 1935, pp. xx, 615, $5.50.) Few books have been awaited with such eagerness as the volume under review. For that reason so much greater is the disappointment when it fails to meet one's expectations.

Count Kokovtsov was Russia's minister of finance for nearly ten years and prime minister for three. He occupied these positions in the critical

years preceding the World War. Yet he reveals himself in this book as one lacking all the essentials of statesmanship. When he describes at length his "chivalrous" action in recommending to the emperor the granting of a "gift" of 200,000 rubles to Count Witte and unfolds all the financial troubles of the negotiator of the Portsmouth treaty, he performs the unlaudable act described in one of Aesop's fables. In another passage (pp. 160-161) he speaks of Stolypin's agrarian reform (in itself the wisest measure that the government had taken in the years 1906-1914) which was to *end* communal ownership in Russia, in such a way that the not too well-informed index compiler listed this reform as "communal land ownership law" (p. 612).

These are only a few instances though the volume is filled with similar ones. It is annoying to find that page after page Kokovtsov speaks about "intreagues" directed against him, and that at the same time he devotes scarcely two pages to the description of the all-important visit of Poincaré to Russia, in 1912. But such is the lack of balance of the entire volume, which greatly diminishes its historical value. Perhaps, out of the 535 pages of text only ten pages are really valuable, *i.e.*, those which fill a brief chapter on Russia's economic development, 1904-1914, compiled from unpublished data. On the whole, after reading Count Kokovtsov's memoirs one is not surprised that Imperial Russia collapsed so readily in 1917.

This review would not be complete without comment on the editorial work done upon the volume. Many of the notes, supposed to clarify the text to an American reader, are historically incorrect. Thus, note 1, p. 539, states that the Imperial Alexander Lyceum was founded in August, 1810, whereas the Imperial Decree establishing the Lyceum was dated January 11, 1811, and the school was actually opened on October 19, of that year. Note 5, p. 539, states that the State Council was established by Emperor Alexander I, in 1801, whereas in reality it was established on January 1, 1810.

Georgetown University. LEONID I. STRAKHOVSKY.

The Social Sciences as School Subjects. By Rolla M. Tryon, Professor of the Teaching of History in the University of Chicago. [American Historical Association, Report of the Commission on the Social Studies, Part XI.] (New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1935, pp. xiii, 541, $3.00.) The author and compiler of this volume of the report has salvaged a mass of interesting and pertinent data covering the history of the social sciences in the schools. Unfortunately it is only a partial record as the treatment of method constituted a separate assignment and is now in course of preparation by one of the members of the Commission. In his effort to handle his theme objectively the writer makes a generous use of statistics. As a record of "national experience" or as "a comprehensive statement of . . . practice" (p. vii), it leaves much to be desired, partly because of the division of labor referred to above, and partly because of the organization followed and the

author's apportionment of emphasis. As illustrations of this are the relegation to a footnote of the significant work of the Joint Commission of 1923 (p. 71) and the pages devoted to forms of organization which are either admitted to have had no influence (p. 500) or are distinctly in the realm of method—an aspect which the author studiously avoids. As a justification of the omissions of important phases, Professor Tryon insists upon the "introductory nature of the treatment" (p. ix).

The five major aspects of this study in the order of their appearance are the "efforts of national organizations in behalf of the social sciences as school subjects" which "serve the useful purpose of furnishing a background" (p. 4), "history as a subject of study", "materials from the field of political science as subjects of study", economics, sociology, and social science, with a final section (division) on "organizing the social sciences for teaching purposes in elementary and secondary schools". Each of these major divisions is again subdivided into short chapters. The chapter divisions for history and political science are preceded by an introductory chapter on the "values claimed" for each and follow a time sequence, *e.g.*, "The Entrance of History in the Schools", "The Establishment of History as a Subject of Study in the Schools, 1860-1900", etc. They represent the major effort of the author to provide a perspective on the present situation. It is so limited, however, in the light of the many important factors involved as to leave unanswered *wie es eigentlich gewesen (oder geworden) ist.* It is a question whether the treatment or the data supplied in the various divisions are such as to enable the reader satisfactorily to reconstruct the situation for himself. A "study of curricular organization" which concerns itself primarily with content omitting the two dominant factors in the selection of that content, namely, the purpose to be served and the classroom handling of materials from the social sciences, tends to emphasize a concept which the Commission has vigorously scored in its volume of *Conclusions and Recommendations,* namely "method disassociated from appropriate content" (p. 71).

New York University. DANIEL C. KNOWLTON.

Roger Ludlow in Chancery. A Note concerning the Formulation of the Fundamental Orders uniting the Three River Towns of Connecticut, 1639. Mr. Ludlow goes for Old England. By R. V. Coleman. (Westport, Connecticut, 1934, 1935, pp. 41, 13, 30.) The writer of these brief studies has succeeded in throwing light upon the career of one of the most influential of the founders of Connecticut, who not only presided at the first court held by the three settlements on the Connecticut River, but also played a leading role in the framing of the two most famous documents in the early history of the colony: the Fundamental Orders of 1639 uniting the three river towns and the Connecticut Code of 1650. *A Note concerning the Formulation of the Fundamental Orders* is especially concerned with ques-

tions relating to the origin and formulation of the latter. While disagreeing with Professor Dutcher that it originated in a general court rather than in a general assembly of the free planters, he does agree with him in ascribing the authorship to Roger Ludlow, in taking issue with those writers past and present who have held that to the Rev. Thomas Hooker should go the chief credit. In *Mr. Ludlow goes for Old England* the question is again raised as to why Ludlow left Connecticut in 1654 never to return. The author repudiates the explanation put forward by many New England historians who have leaned with too much confidence upon statements of earlier writers in accepting the theory of Ludlow's unpopularity with the people and of his resentment against the Connecticut authorities in not supporting his proposed expedition against the Dutch at Manhattan. The third study, although the first to be published, *Roger Ludlow in Chancery* is concerned chiefly with a suit in the high court of chancery instituted in 1660 by Ludlow for the purpose of protecting the interests of his children in the personal estate of his brother George, who after trying New England went to Virginia and became before his death a substantial planter. These hitherto unpublished and neglected proceedings in chancery help to illustrate some aspects of the later years of Ludlow.

All three of the studies under consideration manifest a commendable caution in dealing with both primary and secondary sources of information and an equally commendable reserve in arriving at conclusions.

Lehigh University. LAWRENCE H. GIPSON.

After Coronado: Spanish Exploration Northeast of New Mexico, 1696-1727, Documents from the Archives of Spain, Mexico, and New Mexico. Translated and edited by Alfred Barnaby Thomas, with a historical Introduction. [The Civilization of the American Indian.] (Norman, University of Oklahoma Press, 1935, pp. xii, 307, $3.50.) In the history of the Spanish borderlands two peaks of major activity are generally recognized. The first was in the era of the conquistadors, when De Vaca, De Soto, and Coronado achieved enduring fame in their quest of the northern mysteries. The other, in the latter part of the eighteenth century, was featured by the acquisition of California, Louisiana, and the Floridas, and by expeditions by land and sea beyond New Mexico and California.

Recent research suggests that the opening years of the eighteenth century constituted another particularly vital period. It was then that the Texas colony was founded, then that Father Kino gave Spain and the Church a new province in Pimería Alta, then that the Jesuits developed Baja California.

On the New Mexico salient also, as Professor Thomas reveals in *After Coronado,* this period was one of vigorous advance. After an interval of a century and a half the Spaniards renewed Coronado's efforts to penetrate the Great Plains. Vargas's reconquest of the Pueblos set the stage; need

for controlling the Apaches, missionary zeal, and alarm over increasing French influence among the Plains Indians supplied the motives.

The translated documents, which comprise the bulk of this volume, give a circumstantial account of these *entradas*. Certain leaders, like Ulibarri and Hurtado, are virtually introduced to recorded history. Others, like Villasur, are made persons rather than mere names. In addition, the documents contain a wealth of ethnological data. They reveal, for example, that northeast of Santa Fe the Pueblo culture shaded off gradually instead of abruptly. The Apaches beyond the Cimarron were not primitive hunters, but had terraced adobe houses, agriculture, and irrigation. Included also is the first record of the Comanches, who subsequently were to dominate the southern Plains area.

In format and in general character, *After Coronado* is a fit companion for Professor Thomas's previous book on Anza in New Mexico (*Forgotten Frontiers*). Both represent diligent research in the archives of Spain, Mexico, and New Mexico; both are significant contributions in a neglected field. In this more recent volume, furthermore, the author shows marked improvement in clarity of translation and fluency of style.

The University of California at Los Angeles. JOHN WALTON CAUGHEY.

Economic History of the People of the United States. By Fred Albert Shannon, Department of History and Government, Kansas State College. (New York, Macmillan Company, 1934, pp. xi, 942, $3.75.) A volume of nine hundred closely printed pages of text, which undertakes to survey the trend of economic life in the territory of the United States from the earliest colonial efforts down to the end of 1933 could hardly be expected to present the vast multitude of factual detail in a fashion certain to satisfy everyone. The reviewer cannot recall any volume dealing with the history of the Western Hemisphere, and avowedly submitted as a "cours supérieur", in which so much material has been assembled; one is led to recall the compendious *Handbücher* of political and economic history put together in the days of prewar German scholarship.

Mr. Shannon's style is always effective and at times brilliant. There can be no mistake as to his view with respect to a particular episode, a social trend, or a general economic policy. The students who use the volume will be able to carry away from it a reasonable, organic concept of the rise and course of economic interests, their inter-relation and effects, from colonial days down to our own time. Moreover, they should be able to derive from this volume a better grasp of the historical perspective of the economic life of the remote and recent past than they would be likely to build up on the basis of any other single work of this general character known to the reviewer.

But this emphatic endorsement of the volume as easily foremost in its

field does not mean that the book is all that the reviewer feels could have fairly been expected. The author has allowed his feelings to color his exposition of the trend of economic and social policy during the present century to a point which the reviewer, sympathetic in the main with those same feelings, sincerely regrets. One notices the marked difference in the tone of treatment of comparable trends and acts in the early nineteenth century and at the close of the first third of the twentieth (chs. XII and XXXIV). The discussion of the motives and behavior of those who have carried on the enterprises of production in the West Indies, in Central and South America, and in Mexico may be taken as an illustration. But the book is sound in economic interpretation, and honest in the attempt to present the facts; and for this, we must be grateful. When a second edition is prepared a chapter on the demographic trend in the last quarter century and its significance will be a useful addition.

Washington, D. C. C. E. McGuire.

Frontier Ohio, 1788-1803. By Randolph Chandler Downes, Assistant Professor of History, University of Pittsburgh. [Ohio Historical Collections, Volume III.] (Columbus, Ohio State Archaeological and Historical Society, 1935, pp. xiv, 280, $2.50.) This history of the Ohio Country during the fifteen years preceding statehood begins with an excellent account of Indian relations. Next comes an intimate study of pioneer life. The final third presents the statehood movement. Dr. Downes exposes the rivalry between the politicians of Cincinnati who wished to preserve the importance of their town, threatened by the removal of the seat of government to Chillicothe, and the leaders of the latter community. These Cincinnati leaders effected an alliance with the men of the Marietta region, likewise jealous of Chillicothe, and planned to redivide the Northwest by lines drawn from the Falls of the Ohio and the mouth of the Scioto. Such a division would have made Cincinnati the capital of a territory centering in the Miami Valley, while Marietta would have enjoyed a similar status on the Muskingum. Governor St. Clair's aid was enlisted because he wished to postpone statehood and needed friends to urge his retention as governor. The scheme gained plausibility because the proposed divisions were those designated in the Ordinance of 1784.

This coalition obtained the consent of the territorial legislature to the redivision, whereupon the Scioto Valley leaders lobbied successfully at Washington for an enabling act for a state with bounds as contemplated by the Ordinance of 1787. The coalition now vainly urged two new states, and the contest became a party struggle of Federalists and Republicans; the latter won with the aid of the Washington administration, and by means of a new suffrage law which enfranchised the rank and file in the territory.

Dr. Downes's story is well told. Drawn in large part from manuscript

materials, it fills in the details of a story known heretofore only in outline. It exhibits the prevalence of the popular sovereignty philosophy as a concomitant of frontier life, and opens up the question of the powers of Congress over the internal police of territories which later became so great a constitutional issue. The author seems in general to be a trustworthy interpreter of his period, and his study is a valuable contribution to the history of the frontier. There should be a more careful statement concerning the early Indian treaties; what is said of them and of the Greenville Treaty does not *in toto* make clear what territory the tribes surrendered. The proportion of typographical errors and other minor slips is unduly large.

The Ohio State University. HOMER C. HOCKETT.

Ideas in Motion. By Dixon Ryan Fox. [The Appleton-Century Historical Essays, William E. Lingelbach, Editor.] (New York, D. Appleton-Century Company, 1935, pp. 126, $1.25.) This delightful little book is a credit alike to the author, the editor, and the publishers. It contains four illuminating essays. The first, "Civilization in Transit", features the work of those "pioneers of ideas and special competence" who carried the learning and the refinements of the East into the West. The second, "Culture in Knapsacks", shows how the European soldiers of the American Revolution were, in spite of their profession, the agents of civilization. The third, "A Synthetic Principle in American Social History", suggests that the process of differentiation, of evolution from the simple to the complex, furnishes a reasonable pattern for the social historian to follow. The fourth, "Refuse Ideas and their Disposal", points out, with the millennial idea as the chief example, how the "cast-off garments", once worn by intellectuals, reappear "on the backs of the ignorant".

To Professor Fox's brilliant generalizations the reviewer submits only two minor amendments. First, there is some reason to question whether the *transit* of civilization should be mainly emphasized, or, instead, what *happens* to civilization in transit. The advance of the culture of the East into the West was as natural and inevitable as the advance of the pioneers themselves, and may be taken for granted. Far more significant are the changes in the old culture that were necessitated by the new environment. Secondly, there may be some objection to the author's assumption that the civilization of the West is still definitely inferior to that of the East.

One wonders if Professor Fox really knows all that he should about the West of today. "Where is the public library frontier of 1935?" he inquires. "The picture gallery frontier? The chamber music frontier?" The reviewer hazards the opinion that each of these three frontiers would now be as difficult to locate as the frontier of population had become by 1890. Nor is the author quite fair to the West when he cites a recent issue of the New York *Times* for a sermon on the Book of Revelation—"the Book

that tells of the secret coming of Christ for the Church . . . the rise of Iron men like Mussolini . . . the future of the Devil . . ."—and then remarks, four pages farther on, "So the intellectual garments once cast off in New Haven are now worn by prominent people in Tennessee and Arkansas". Perhaps if the citation had come from the Chattanooga *News* or the *Arkansas Gazette* it would have been more convincing. But probably not, for the prominent people of Tennessee and Arkansas ordinarily think about the same thoughts as the prominent people of New Haven and New York. It would seem that vertical and horizontal lines of development have somehow been confused.

About a dozen years ago a conscious carrier of culture from the East on a mission to a certain state capital and university city in nearly the exact geographic center of the United States inquired of one of the prominent people of the place, "How far east do you have to go to find a really good library", and was met by the devastating reply, "To the British Museum". Perhaps he said about all that the reviewer has in mind.

The University of Wisconsin. JOHN D. HICKS.

"Here I have Lived": a History of Lincoln's Springfield, 1821-1865. By Paul M. Angle. (Springfield, Abraham Lincoln Association, 1935, pp. xv, 313, $3.00.) In various of its aspects history may be considered an accumulation of thousands of place stories. Some day we may have a historical dictionary of American places comparable (though that would be high praise) to the *Dictionary of American Biography*. Meanwhile not only the historian but the general reader is the gainer for every place study of the type before us. Mr. Angle takes his title from Lincoln's words of classic brevity (February 11, 1861) in bidding goodbye to his neighbors. The main significance of the book, perhaps, even above the Lincoln interest, is its presentation of a segment of American social history. The reader surveys in reality the development of culture from frontier sod to the enlarging interests of a teeming commonwealth. If the crudity of the town was shown in the worst mud the state afforded (p. 90) and in a wagonload of rattlesnakes locally gathered to fill a demand for snake oil in 1821 (pp. 20-21), its culture appeared in its balls, its Young Men's Lyceum, and its many contacts with the outside world. Step by step as civilization advanced westward there came to Springfield all the manifestations of settled life: newspapers, churches, fraternal orders, schools, state fairs, a hotel which "wear[ied] the eye with magnificence" (p. 88), a "library association", Ole Bull, Patti, R. W. Emerson, Bayard Taylor, a horticultural society, an academy, a "female seminary", "Illinois State University" (not to be confused with the University of Illinois at Urbana), and, of course, all the activities, social, economic, and political, that center in a capital.

As a setting for Lincoln some of the significant things about the little

city were its Southern antecedents, its marked opposition to abolitionism, its lack of any public condemnation of Lovejoy's murder, its debt to Lincoln for the location of the capital, its narrow majorities for Lincoln in 1860 and 1864 (at which times Sangamon County went Democratic), and its sizable Democratic majority in 1862. Though indicating sources in an orderly bibliography, Mr. Angle, contrary to his "own inclinations" (p. 293), avoids footnotes. In this respect, as in its readable style, the book is designed for the general reader. That it meets this need and at the same time satisfies the scholar is proof of a successful combination of artistry and research.

The University of Illinois. J. G. RANDALL.

Die deutsch-amerikanischen Beziehungen 1890-1914. Von Ilse Kunz-Lack. [Beiträge zur Geschichte der nachbismarckischen Zeit und des Weltkriegs.] (Stuttgart, W. Kohlhammer, 1935, pp. 242, 12 M.) The major issues in German-American diplomacy in the quarter century before the World War are traceable to the imperialistic, expansionist tendencies of the period, and the jockeying for position in the constellation of powers. This volume is devoted to the more important points where the orbits of the two nations crossed—rivalry for South American markets, the Venezuela affair, the open door in China before and after the Russo-Japanese War, the Morocco crisis, the race for armaments, and the Hague Conferences and subsequent attempts to organize the forces of peace. On some of these issues the United States and Germany thought alike; on others, for reasons which the author has set forth convincingly, each had to go its way alone.

This review is too brief to portray adequately the contents of this excellent study. The writer has used all the important materials, and has made a notable contribution by checking our traditional accounts against *Die Grosse Politik* and other German sources. As a result, incidents appear in a better and truer perspective. To take but one example, Roosevelt's role in the Venezuelan episode, and in the Algeciras Conference, is considerably deflated, and on minor points, the author takes issue with American scholars like Treat, Dennett, and Nevins. The force of public opinion in both countries has not been overlooked, nor the influence of the personal friendships and dislikes of leading actors like Roosevelt, the Kaiser, Cecil Spring Rice, Jusserand, Speck von Sternburg, and others. The author displays real capacity to explain incidents in great detail, without once losing sight of their proper interrelation.

The dominant theme of this critical period was what the author calls the Anglo-American-German triangle. The rivalry for American friendship led sometimes to ridiculous maneuvers, but the Anglo-American legs of the triangle grew steadily stronger and longer, after Chamberlain's proposal for an entente among these nations had been spurned by what Eugen Fischer aptly called "Holsteins grosses Nein". Fundamentally, the whole mentality

and ideology of Americans and Germans was different, and the Germans were no match for their British cousins in comprehending the American psychology. By 1914, there were no points of friction between Germany and the United States, but also no bonds of understanding.

This book deserves careful reading by American students of foreign policy. It is a real contribution and thoroughly documented. It is regrettable that the proof reading of the many English quotations was not more carefully done.

The Ohio State University. CARL WITTKE.

William Mahone of Virginia, Soldier and Political Insurgent. By Nelson Morehouse Blake. (Richmond, Garrett and Massie, 1935, pp. xv, 323, $3.00.) This book is a historical biography of Mahone as railroad builder and consolidator and party boss as well as "soldier and political insurgent". For its principal contents Dr. Blake has relied mainly (though not entirely) upon three published monographs and the numerous but hitherto little used Mahone Papers—the latter now reposing in Duke University Library, to the shame of Virginia institutions. Apart from his generous acknowledgment of others' work, the author's meticulous carefulness in handling his materials stands out. He is, undoubtedly, a born archivist. For this reason one is surprised that, while they have filled in and confirmed the old Mahone writers like French and Elam, the Papers have yielded relatively little that is new; were they at some time expurgated? If for this no blame attaches to the author, still he must be charged with omission of rather familiar items of greater or less importance. Just how, for example, did Mahone control the Richmond *Whig?* Did he run away from challenges to duels, bulldoze inferiors, and bluff in unsportsmanlike ways at poker? What were his relations with the saloon forces, and why his endorsement of a general local option election law? What has become of the original Lacy letter in which General Lee's preference for Mahone as a "successor" was asserted? Has Freeman nothing on Lee's opinion of Mahone as a soldier? Moreover, and more important, few will be able to think of Mahone as primarily actuated by intelligent and disinterested patriotism especially in his later years. That he rendered Virginia valuable services in railroading and in meeting new political situations has been successfully asserted by students of the period, and some of them even credit him with pioneering in Southern liberalism. But his swing to the Republicans and the big bosses of doubtful repute—to Cameron, Arthur, Grant, Butler—that is another matter. For all this, however, the biography is a useful one—replete with interesting and accurate facts garnered and stated in workmanlike fashion, infused with the desire to give the hero his rightful place, and very interesting.

Wake Forest College. C. C. PEARSON.

HISTORICAL NEWS

AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

The office of the *American Historical Review* has been transferred to 535 West 114th Street, New York City. Correspondence in regard to contributions, together with books for review, should be sent to the Managing Editor, Professor R. L. Schuyler.

Two new volumes published under the auspices of the Association have recently appeared: *French Opinion on the United States and Mexico, 1860-1867: Extracts from the Reports of the Procureurs Généraux* [a publication of the Beveridge Memorial Fund], compiled and edited by Lynn M. Case, Ph.D., The Rice Institute, and *The Older Middle West, 1840-1880: Its Social, Economic and Political Life and Sectional Tendencies, Before, During and After the Civil War* [The Carnegie Revolving Fund], by Henry Clyde Hubbart, Professor of History, Ohio Wesleyan University.

According to the second provisional program of the Fourth Anglo-American Conference of Historians, which is in session from the sixth to the eleventh of this month, scholars from the United States are to read papers at three of the sectional meetings. At the section on the "History of Parliamentary Institutions" Professor Wallace Notestein is to speak on "Lobbying in the House of Commons". For "Colonial History" Professor T. J. Wertenbaker is to speak on "The Founding of American Civilization", while for the "Historical Relations between Europe and the American Continents" Professor A. S. Aiton is to discuss "The Study of Latin-American History in the United States", and Miss Irene Wright is to present a paper on "The Scope and Facilities for the Study of Latin-American History in Spain". A paper at one of the general sessions which will be awaited with keen interest is "Has History any Shape or Pattern?" by Professor A. J. Toynbee. The hospitalities and "visits", including the Houses of Parliament, the Worshipful Company of Mercers, Lambeth Palace, Canterbury, and the Royal Docks, are bewildering in number and grandeur, but the ever present cup of tea will save many nervous organisms from strain.

ADDITIONS TO THE LIST OF RESEARCH PROJECTS

[Research work undertaken to satisfy the requirements of advanced degrees not included]

IV. Modern Europe

A biography of Madame de Krüdener. Prog. E. J. Knapton, *Wheaton*.

XVIII. United States of America

Check list of bibliographies of United States History. Prog. 4 years. Henry P. Beers, *National Archives*.

PERSONAL

Carl S. Driver, assistant professor of history at Vanderbilt University since 1929, died on March 23 at the age of 40. His research interest was in the history of the Old Southwest, his most important contribution being *John Sevier, a Pioneer of the Old Southwest* (1932). He prepared the editorial notes for an annotated reprint of Charles William Janson, *The Stranger in America,* which was published in the early part of this year.

Tracy W. McGregor, philanthropist and collector of Americana, died on May 6 at the age of 67. His father had spent a life in social service work, and from him Mr. McGregor inherited the responsibility for the McGregor Institute. To assume this burden he left Oberlin in his third year, and thereafter devoted his life and his wealth to the cause of the unfortunate, the sick, the feeble-minded, and the victims of modern civilization. Early a resident of Detroit, he organized the Community Fund, was an officer in the Merrill-Palmer School, the Good Will Farm School, the Wayne County Training School, and fostered many other charities. He finally gave most of his wealth to establish "McGregor Fund", which was charged with the obligation of carrying on his manifold and self-impo ed work. In the last eight years of his life, most of the time as a resident of Washington, he turned the dynamic energy of his being toward the collecting of rare books in American history. A man of innately good taste, and wide reading, he was ideally equipped for such work. His library soon acquired a national reputation and he appeared to be the coming collector, as men like H. E. Huntington, H. C. Folger, and W. L. Clements passed off the stage. In 1933 he established a fund to help college libraries collect rare Americana, and the American Historical Association appointed its Committee on Early Americana in College Libraries at his request expressly to co-operate with him. In the fall of 1935, he acquired the great William Gwinn Mather collection of Matheriana. His interest in the University of Michigan is attested by such widely different gifts as funds for rare books in the Clements Library, and a solar tower for the department of astronomy. He was a member of the Board of Trustees of the American Historical Association. The ruling passion of his life was a desire to help. A few of his thoughts and experiences in the field of social service may be found in his little book *Toward a Philosophy of the Inner Life* (Washington, 1933). R. G. A.

Johannes C. H. R. Steenstrup, long recognized as the dean of Danish historians, died on August 3, 1935, at the age of ninety. Professor Steenstrup was trained for the legal profession but his inclinations from the very beginning of his career led toward historical research, at first toward problems in legal history and later toward the general history of Denmark in the Middle Ages. His career was extended and highly fruitful. His first contribution to history was published in *Danske Samlinger* in 1873; his last in

Historisk Tidsskrift in 1934. The Steenstrup bibliography included 664 items, of which 253 are in the form of books or of articles and reviews published in historical or other scientific periodicals. L. M. L.

Georges Lacour-Gayet, the biographer of Talleyrand, died in December at the age of 80. His brilliant promise as a student at the École normale supérieure was more than fulfilled by his later achievements. His historical works began with a volume on *Antonin le Pieux et son temps* (1888). He next turned to the history of the navy, and produced three volumes on *La Marine française* from the reign of Louis XIII to that of Louis XVI (1902-1911). His later years were devoted chiefly to the study of Talleyrand, during which he wrote a three-volume biography with a supplementary volume of *Mélanges*. Another distinguished French historian, Pierre de Nolhac, is also to be counted among the notable losses of recent months. Long the "Conservateur" of the palace of Versailles he renewed its history in a series of charming volumes.

Henri Sée, who has done much to explain the economic life of France under the Old Regime and the Revolution, died on March 10. Born in 1864, he long held a professorship in the University of Rennes. His earliest work was on the Middle Ages, *Bertrand du Guesclin et son temps* (1899) and *Les classes rurales et le régime domanial en France au Moyen Age* (1901). His first important work on the Revolutionary period was as editor, with André Lesort, of four volumes of *Cahiers de doléances* (1909-1912) of the Department of Ille et Vilaine, of which Rennes is the capital. From that time he published several works on the eighteenth century, notably *L'évolution commerciale et industrielle de la France sous l'ancien régime* and *La France économique et sociale au XVIII^e siècle* (both in 1925, the latter translated). One of his latest contributions was a fully annotated translation into French of Arthur Young's *Travels in France* (3 vols., 1931).

Two distinguished German historians have recently died, Karl Hampe, the medievalist, and Alfred Stern, who has done important work on the Modern period. Professor Hampe was 67 and Professor Stern nearly 90. The principal works of the former were: *Deutsche Kaisergeschichte in der Zeit der Salier und Staufer* (1909, 5th ed., 1923) and *Das Hochmittelalter: Geschichte des Abendlandes von 900 bis 1250* (1932). Professor Stern wrote a *Geschichte Europas seit den Verträgen von 1815 bis zum Frankfurter Frieden von 1871* (1894-1924). He was also author of *Das Leben Mirabeaus* (1889).

The grants-in-aid in the historical field, awarded by the American Council of Learned Societies, with the project upon which the incumbent is engaged are: Pearl Kibre, Columbia University, a catalogue of *Incipits* of writings dealing with science and magic before 1500; Margaret Rickert, English illumination as represented by manuscripts of the end of the fourteenth century; Harold E. Wethey, Bryn Mawr College, fifteenth century sculpture

in Navarre, Catalonia, and Majorca; Meribeth E. Cameron, Western Reserve University, history and cultural development of modern China; Clifford M. Crist, Princeton University, a definitive edition of Voltaire's *Dictionnaire philosophique;* Alexander H. Schutz, Ohio State University, edition of a treatise on falconry by Daude de Pradas; W. T. Morgan, Indiana University, bibliography of British history, 1700-1715; Culver H. Smith, University of Chattanooga, a historical guide to the opinion-forming press of the United States. Grants-in-aid of publication are: Ray F. Harvey, The Political Philosophy of Jean Jacques Burlamaqui and his Influence upon American Constitutional Theory, to be published by the University of North Carolina Press; Earl H. Pritchard, The Crucial Years in Early Anglo-Chinese Relations, 1750-1800, to be published by the State College of Washington.

The Social Science Research Council has awarded the following grants-in-aid in the historical field: Carl Bridenbaugh, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, urban development in colonial America; Harold E. Briggs, University of Iowa, frontiers of the Northwest; Wilhelm Cohnstaedt, the German Republic; Edward Samuel Corwin, Princeton University, the present stage of American constitutional law and theory; Cornelius W. de Kiewiet, State University of Iowa, the economic growth of the British Empire in the nineteenth century; Edith Dobie, University of Washington, British colonial policy, 1830-1841; Christina Hallowell Garrett, the Marian Exile, 1553-1559; Paul Wallace Gates, Bucknell University, the disposal of the public domain, 1789-1865; Edward G. Kirkland, Bowdoin College, New England capitalists, 1815-1875; Hans Kohn, Smith College, the social, economic, political, and cultural implications of nationalism; Paul Kosok, Long Island University, the history of Indian caste systems; Hugh Talmage Lefler, University of North Carolina, the social influence of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel; William Alfred Morris, University of California, the office of the sheriff and the county court, 1307-1485; Vernon John Puryear, Humbolt State College, French policy in the Near East, 1798-1833; Carl Coke Rister, University of Oklahoma, General P. H. Sheridan's Indian command; Robert Sidney Smith, Duke University, the commerce and shipping of Barcelona, 1300-1600; Walter B. Smith, Williams College, the Second Bank of the United States; Eugene Hendrix Stevenson, Lebanon Valley College, the effect of the Black Death on the king's escheats; Robert Stanley Thomson, Russell Sage College, French colonial policy in Indo-China; Charles H. Wesley, Howard University, the role of the Negro in the abolition movement. The post-doctoral fellowships are: John Clinton Adams, Holmes Junior College, the Balkan states of recent Balkan diplomatic history; Lewis U. Hanke, Harvard University, the human geography and cultural anthropology of Latin America; Thomas W. Wallbank, Santa Monica Junior College, the culture of native peoples in relation to current problems of colonial administration. Pre-doctoral field fellowships are: John T. Bobbitt, University of Chicago, the organization and propaganda

of farmer protest groups; Richard H. Heindel, University of Pennsylvania, the British reaction to American expansion.

A Guggenheim fellowship has been awarded to Ernest Staples Osgood, assistant professor of history at the University of Minnesota, for work on a book on Montana as the basis of the evolution of a typical Far Western state.

The Huntington Library announces the appointment of Professor Edwin F. Gay, of Harvard University, to its permanent research staff, and of Dr. Edward H. Tatum, of the University of California at Los Angeles, as assistant to the Director for two years, and to carry on an investigation of the American attitude toward England after the Revolution. F. M. Powicke, Regius Professor of Modern history at Oxford University, is to be a visiting scholar for several months beginning in October.

Announcement is made of the following promotions: *University of California at Los Angeles,* Andre Lobanov-Rostovsky to be associate professor; *Dartmouth College,* John R. Williams and A. Howard Meneely to be professors, and Lewis R. Stilwell and Robert E. Riegel to be transferred to the history department; *Harvard University,* James Phinney Baxter, 3d, and Frederick Merk to be professors, William Leonard Langer to be Coolidge Professor of History, and Paul Herman Buck to be assistant professor; *State University of Iowa,* W. R. Livingston, C. W. de Kiewiet, and H. J. Thornton to be associate professors; *University of Michigan,* Albert Hyma to be professor and Lewis G. Vander Velde to be associate professor; *University of Missouri,* Charles F. Mullett to be associate professor; *New York University,* Thomas Childs Cochran and Walter George Wirthwein to be assistant professors; *Oberlin College,* Frederick B. Artz to be professor; *The Ohio State University,* William F. McDonald to be professor; *Stanford University,* Harold Henry Fisher to be professor and Charles Albro Barker, Harold Whitman Bradley, and Merrill Ten Broeck Spalding to be assistant professors.

William L. Langer, professor at Harvard University, will serve also as professor of diplomatic history at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy. Hajo Holborn, now of Yale, has been appointed visiting professor of Diplomatic history.

The following appointments may be noted: *American University,* Eugene N. Anderson, of the University of Chicago, as professor, Richard H. Bauer, formerly of Lewis Institute, has been assistant professor since the fall of 1935; *Colorado University,* S. Harrison Thomson, of Carleton College, as professor of Medieval history and as editor of the bulletin *Progress of Medieval Studies in the United States of America and Canada; Columbia University,* Thomas H. Thomas as visiting lecturer in Military history during the spring term of 1937; *Lehigh University,* Amos A. Ettinger as acting associate professor for the year 1936-1937; *University of Pennsylvania,* Arthur Preston Whitaker, of Cornell University, as professor.

Further appointments for summer sessions may be noted: *Indiana University,* E. R. Adair; *New York University,* Arthur P. Whitaker; *Stanford University,* Harold W. V. Temperley; *University of Tennessee,* G. Leighton LaFuze.

Leaves of absence for the year 1936-1937 have been granted as follows: *Lehigh University,* Sydney M. Brown, to be in England and France; *Stanford University,* Albert Guérard, to be traveling, chiefly in Europe.

Professor John E. Pomfret, of Princeton, will be on leave for the year 1936-1937, acting as secretary to the Social Science Research Council.

Articles: W. F. Albright, *James Henry Breasted, Humanist* (Am. Scholar, summer); G. N. Clark, *Sir Charles Firth* (Eng. Hist. Rev., Apr.); Henri Hauser, *Henri Pirenne* (Rev. Hist. Mod., Nov.); Léo Mouton, *Georges Lacour-Gayet* (Rev. Études Hist., Jan.); B. Combes de Patris, *Pierre de Nolhac* (*ibid.*).

Documents: Maurice Toussaint, ed., *Lettres de Christian Pfister à Camille Jullian* (An. Est, 1936, no. 1).

GENERAL

General review: T. Barath, *L'histoire en Hongrie* [I] (Rev. Hist., Jan.); Alf Sommerfelt, *Les études collectives en Scandinavie* (Rev. Synthèse, 1936, no. 1).

Number 29 of the *Bulletin* of the International Committee of Historical Sciences is mainly devoted to papers supplied by the Commission on the Great Voyages and Discoveries, presenting a bibliography of 80 pages and articles by Eugene Déprez on the relation between the great discoveries and the origins of colonial imperialism; by Roberto Almazià on recent studies respecting Columbus; by Pierre de Cenival on the partition between Spain and Portugal of their early Moroccan conquests; by Jan Dabrowski on discovery and its results in the region between the Baltic and the Black Sea; and by B. Mendi on the influence of the great discoveries upon money in Bohemia. The Commission on Diplomatic History announces the publication of Volume I, 1648-1715, of its *Repertorium der diplomatischen Vertreter aller Länder* (Gerhard Stalling, pp. 640, 36 M.), a work of great labor, which has been long in preparation in various chancelleries, and will be indispensable to students of the diplomatic history of Europe in the period named. Volume II will cover the period 1716-1814, volume III, 1815-1914, volume IV, 1915 to the present. These later volumes will include American as well as European data. J. F. J.

For nearly two years the Training Centre for Far Eastern Studies in the Library of Congress has been engaged, under the editorial direction of Dr. A. W. Hummel, upon a Dictionary of Ch'ing Dynasty Biography. The

work on personages of the seventeenth century is almost completed. About four hundred sketches are ready. In this work the Centre has had the co-operation of many sinologists of various countries. In taking up the sections dealing with the eighteenth, nineteenth, and the first few years of the twentieth centuries, Dr. Hummel and Dr. Mortimer Graves, of the American Council of Learned Societies and secretary of the Committees on Far Eastern Studies, hope for a still wider co-operation. They have sent out to persons known to be interested in the field a pamphlet containing twenty-two of the completed biographies, to serve as examples of what is desired. Already they have begun to receive articles dealing with eminent Chinese of the eighteenth century.

The British Records Association has now been in existence three years and a half, serving as a link between institutions or individuals interested in the preservation, study, and publication of records. It is prepared to communicate technical information to both individuals and institutions. In order to make co-operation in this general field more effective, the association desires to increase its membership, especially among institutions. The fee to the latter is £1 a year, to individuals five shillings. Although not primarily a publication body, the association occasionally issues leaflets, including accounts of conferences, reports, etc. It may be addressed care of the Institute of Historical Research, Malet Street, London, W. C. 1.

As a part of the co-operative work now being done by the American Library Association and the Co-operative Cataloging Service of the Library of Congress in analyzing difficult series and sets of publications, entries will soon begin to be printed for both the Greek and the Latin series of Migne's *Patrologia*. The Co-operative Cataloging Service of the Library of Congress will carry along at the same time the analysis of the three principal sets of the writings of the Fathers in English. Those interested in obtaining sets of these cards are invited to write for fuller information to the American Library Association, Co-operative Cataloging Committee, Library of Congress, Washington, D. C.

Methodology of Social Science Research (University of California Press, 1936, pp. x, 159, $2.00), by Dorothy Campbell Culver, is a bibliography of the rapidly growing literature of method as applied to the social sciences. Its practical value to students is increased by two indexes, author and subject. The Bureau of Public Administration of the University of California is the sponsor.

Papers and Proceedings of the Forty-eighth Annual Meeting of the American Economic Association appears as a supplement to the March number of the *American Economic Review*.

The steadily increasing interest in the history of science is illustrated in the launching of a new journal, *The Annals of Science: a Quarterly Review*

of the History of Science since the Renaissance (London, Taylor and Francis), of which the first number appeared on January 15, under the editorship of D. McKie, of University College, London, Harcourt Brown, Washington University, St. Louis, and H. W. Robinson, librarian of the Royal Historical Society. The editors propose to emphasize the place of natural science among the "humanities" and to recall that there is even romance in the pursuit of natural knowledge, a devotion which should "evoke a widened sympathy and interest for the subject". Among the articles in the first number are: "Early Nautical Charts", by N. H. de Vaudrey Heathcote, and "Richard Boyle, Esq., M. P., F. R. S., and—Incidentally—Some of his Relatives", by T. S. Patterson.

The Franco-American Review: a Quarterly devoted to History, Literature and Criticism is an ambitious experiment in intellectual co-operation. It has both an American and a French board of editors. The American board includes Messrs. Allison, Baldensperger, Chinard, Finley, Gottschalk, Guérard, Hayes, Tinker, Whitridge, Monaghan, and Madame Muret. Dr. Monaghan is the secretary. On the French board are among others, MM. Faÿ, Préclin, Sagnac, and Siegfried. The first number was to appear in June.

A group of organizations representing every important phase of American education has arranged the first National Conference on Educational Broadcasting in Washington, D. C., on December 10-12. The program will include topics drawn from all aspects of the problem. C. S. Marsh, of the American Council on Education, 744 Jackson Place, Washington, D. C., is acting as executive secretary for the planning committee.

An ancient and practical art is described in *Basketwork through the Ages* (Oxford University Press, 1936, pp. xv, 174, $5.00), by H. H. Bobart, an appropriate historical task for a "Clerk to the Basketmakers' Company" of London, to the "Wardens and Court of Assistants" of which the small volume is dedicated. It is abundantly illustrated. One section deals with the company.

Among the contents of the *Bulletin* of the Belgian Commission royale d'histoire (vol. XCIX, no. 2) are: "Un prétendu original de la donation d'Eisenach, en 762, à l'abbaye d'Echternach", by H. Pirenne and J. Vannérus; "Tollen van den hertog van Brabant te Leuven in de 14de eeuw", by H. Vander Linden; and "Le dénombrement des foyers en Flandre en 1469", by J. De Smet.

The four hundredth anniversary of the death of Erasmus is to be the theme of memorial addresses arranged for by the City of Rotterdam. The United States will be represented by Professor Albert Hyma of the University of Michigan. There is also to be an exposition of rare and valuable editions of the works of Erasmus.

Dr. Johannes Haller's *Tausend Jahre deutsch-französischer Beziehungen* (Stuttgart, J. G. Cotta, 1936, pp. xi, 246, 5 M.), originally published in 1930, has reached a third, revised and enlarged edition. The subject is of greater moment now than even at the date of its original publication.

Vol. LXIII of the Atti della Società ligure di storia patria is *Diplomatici e consoli della Repubblica di Genova* (Genoa, 1934, pp. 341), which is a valuable addition to the lists of diplomatic agents of several other states already published.

The publication of a revised edition has enabled Herbert H. Gowen to bring down to date his *Asia: a Short History from the Earliest Times to the Present Day* (Little, Brown, 1936, pp. xx, 463, $3.50). It was first published in 1926 and has been reprinted several times since that date.

It was a happy thought to make available for a wider circle of readers in *Studies in Anglo-French History* (Cambridge, University Press; Macmillan, pp. xiv, 179, $2.75) several of the papers presented at the historical conferences of 1933, held at Paris, and of 1934, held at London. The editors are Alfred Coville and Harold Temperley. There are two groups, the first dealing with the eighteenth century, and the second with the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The writers have taken advantage of the actual discussions at the conferences to modify, or further develop, their treatment of the topics in question. Among these topics may be mentioned "Anglo-French Finance in the Time of the South Sea Bubble", by Henri Hauser; "Lord Palmerston at Work, 1830-1841", by C. K. Webster; and "The Début of M. Paul Cambon in England, 1899-1903", by Paul Mantoux. M. Renouvin has been responsible for the translations of the French essays.

Professor Wesley C. Mitchell has rendered an important service in editing a selection from Thorstein Veblen's writings under the title of *What Veblen Taught* (Viking Press, 1936, pp. xlix, 503, $3.00). He has furnished the volume with a substantial introduction.

Dr. Lewis H. Haney's *History of Economic Thought* (Macmillan, pp. xx, 827, $3.60) has reached a third and enlarged edition.

Among the articles in vol. XXXIV of the *Basler Zeitschrift* (1935) are: "Aktenstücke zur Laufbahn Jacob Burckhardts", by Paul Roth; "Das Predigerkloster in Basel von der Gründung bis zur Klosterreform, 1233-1429" [II], by Georg Boner; and "Die Basler Pfarrerfamilie Serin", by Karl Gauss.

The Alexander Prize of the Royal Historical Society for 1937 will be awarded for the best essay on any subject approved by the Literary Director. The Alexander Medal has been awarded to Miss R. J. Mitchell for her essay on "English Students at Padua, 1460-1475".

In 1938 for the second time the Alfons Dopsch Prize will be awarded for the best essay upon "Die Bedeutung des Lehenwesens für die Wirtschaft".

It is open to young scholars who are not yet upon salaried appointment. The essays should be submitted to Professor Dopsch before February 15, 1938.

Articles: W. R. Inge, *Historicism and Religion* (History, Mar.); Vladimir G. Simkhovitch, *Approaches to History* [VI] (Pol. Sci. Quar., Mar.); Edgar Erskine Hume, *The Centennial of the World's Largest Medical Library: the Army Medical Library of Washington, Founded 1836* (Military Surgeon, Apr.); W. H. Michael, *The Ship's Surgeon of Three Centuries Ago* (*ibid.*); Cecil King, *Flags in Marine Art* (Mariner's Mirror, Apr.); Hugh Nicol, *The Two Ends of Straw* (Agricultural History, Jan.); Victor L. Tapié, *Une esquisse de l'évolution historique de la Tchécoslovaquie* (Rev. Hist., Jan.); Josef Pfitzner, *Neue Wege der tschechischen Geschichtswissenschaft* (Hist. Zeitsch., Mar.); Hermann Haering, *Zur Geschichte der neueren Historiographie* [apropos of a new edition of Fueter] (*ibid.*); Lucien Febvre, *Les recherches collectives et l'avenir de l'histoire* (Rev. Synthèse, Feb.); H. D. Fong, *The Growth and Decline of Rural Industrial Enterprise in North China* (Nankai Soc. and Ec. Quar., Jan.).

ANCIENT HISTORY

The following reports of excavations and summaries of recent discoveries are worthy of notice. S. R. K. Glanville has a report in *Antiquity* for March of recent excavations in Egypt, and E. Paribeni a preliminary report in *Aegyptus* for December on excavations at Hibeh. The *Quarterly* of the Department of Antiquities in Palestine (V, nos. 1-2) contains articles upon a series of recent finds, Roman cisterns at Beit Natlif by D. C. Baranki, mosaic pavements at El Hammam, Beisan, by M. Avi-Yonah, excavations at Pilgrim's Castle 'Atlib (1932-1933) by C. N. Johns, and a hoard of bronzes from Askalon by J. H. Iliffe. J. Garstang's fourth report upon the city and necropolis of Jericho has appeared in *Annals of Archaeology and Anthropology* (XXI, nos. 3-4). W. F. Albright gives a summary of recent finds in Palestine and Syria in the *American Journal of Archaeology* for March; J. Marquet Krause reports in *Syria* (XVI, no. 4) on the second campaign of excavations at Ay (1934). In the classical field we may note E. P. Blegen's news items from Athens, R. Stillwell's report on the excavations at Corinth (1934-1935), and W. A. Campbell's account of the third season of excavation at Antioch-on-the-Orontes, all in the *American Journal of Archaeology* for March.

Bibliographical aids include a papyrological bulletin for 1934 by P. Collart in the *Revue des études grecques* for December, and by H. Henne in the *Revue des études anciennes* for March; there is also the regular survey in *Aegyptus* for December. A. Grenier's *Chronique gallo-romaine* appears also in the *Revue des études anciennes* for March.

Articles involving criticism of literary sources include those of G. De

Sanctis on the 'logos' of Croesus and the proemium of the history of Herodotus in *Rivista di filologia* for March; H. N. Couch on the last words of Pericles (Plutarch, *Per.* 38, 4) in the *Classical Journal* for May; A. Klotz on the relative position of Dio Cassius among the sources for the history of the second Punic war in *Rheinisches Museum,* LXXXV, no. 1; and E. M. Sanford on propaganda and censorship in the transmission of Josephus in the *Transactions* (1935) of the American Philological Association.

New inscriptional material appears in G. Boson's article on some cuneiform inscriptions in the Museum of Turin in *Aegyptus* for December. J. H. Oliver has published an Athenian decree concerning Miletus in 450-449 B. C. in the *Transactions* of the American Philological Association. G. De Sanctis revises some of his conclusions regarding the Athenian assessment of 425 B. C. in the *Rivista di filologia* for December. In the same journal appear notes by M. Segre on the treaty between Philip and the Chalcidians, and by M. Guarducci on Cretan inscriptions. L. Robert's work brings revisions of the text and new interpretations of inscriptions of Thrace, Asia Minor, Greece, Dalmatia, and Persia in *Revue de philologie* for April. G. Klaffenbach writes on an inscription of Gytheum in *Hermes,* LXXI, no. 1. The supplement to the Austrian *Jahreshefte,* XXIX, no. 1, contains articles by E. Groag on some new inscriptions, by F. Jantsch on inscriptions from Kärnten, by F. Narobe on Roman milestones in Tauernstrasse, and by A. Betz on Roman military inscriptions in Austria. Note also L. R. Taylor on the Publii Lucilii Gamalae of Ostia in the *American Journal of Philology* for April, and R. E. G. Downey on references to inscriptions in the Chronicle of Malalas in the *Transactions* of the American Philological Association.

For other archaeological articles of some historical importance, see G. A. Wainwright on the coming of iron (*Antiquity,* Mar.), T. B. Brown on Achaean pottery in *Annals of Archaeology and Anthropology* (XXI, nos. 3-4), G. W. Elderkin on the seated deities of the Parthenon frieze in the *American Journal of Archaeology* for March, R. F. Jessup on Roman barrows in *Antiquity* for March, and T. S. Duncan on some unique coins in the Wulfing collection at Washington University in the *Classical Journal* for April.

The following articles have special value to students of economic history: M. F. McGregor on Cleon, Nicias, and the trebling of the tribute (*Trans.* Am. Philol. Assoc., 1935); S. Accame on the decree of Callias in relation to the history of Athenian finance (*Riv. Filol.,* Dec.); O. W. Reinmuth on two prefectural edicts affecting the publicani (*Class. Philol.,* Apr.); H. G. Ramsay on government relief during the Roman Empire (*Class. Jour.,* May); A. Landry on depopulation in ancient times (*Rev. Hist.,* Feb.).

The dissertation entitled *The Invective In Rufinum of Claudius Claudianus* (Geneva, W. F. Humphrey Press, 1935), by H. L. Levy, publishes as a separate edition with historical introduction and textual commentary a

poem which is a historical document of some importance. The author has been mainly concerned to establish a good text. This he appears to have done competently and with adequate notes and apparatus but has purposely avoided for the present the task of providing a full exegetical commentary. The introduction contains an independent study of the historical background of the poem, and particularly of the career of Rufinus. Appendixes include special discussions of the relations between Rufinus, Symmachus, and Flavianus, of the partition of Illyricum, and of Palanque's theory that Rufinus served under Valentinian II at Vienne after 391 A. D.

The title of the essay on *Effects of the Germanic Invasions on Gaul, 234-284 A. D.* (University of California Publications in History, XVII, no. 2, 1934), by I. J. Manly, hardly represents its chief value; for it soon resolves itself into a study of the causes, manifestations, and effects of the general state of insecurity in Gaul under the military anarchy. In this the Germanic invasions undoubtedly play an important part but whether as cause or effect of political and military movements within the empire is at times difficult to see and the actual effects of the invasions are equally difficult to distinguish. Miss Manly's awareness of this has kept her from finding many results to attribute to the German invasions that do not arise from the general state of insecurity. The main value of the study lies rather in her independent judgments upon special points, the gathering of the very extensive special literature upon this period in Gaul, and her attempt to give political and economic significance to the distribution and date of the numerous Gallic coin hoards of the third century A. D.

L'ostracisme athénien (Félix Alcan, 1935, pp. xii, 262, 30 fr.), by Professor Jérôme Carcopino, is substantially a reprint of a study published under the title *Histoire de l'ostracisme athénien* in vol. XXV of the Bibliothèque de la Faculté des lettres, Paris, 1909. It presents to us in a separate book with larger type and better paper Carcopino's attractively written examination of this singular democratic device, in which he finds expressed "la mesure et la mansuétude que l'humain génie d'Athènes, au V^{e} siècle avant notre ère, sut montrer jusque dans ses haines et ses exils". Except for a few new references the scholarly apparatus remains unchanged. A few pages (intercalated without a sufficiently careful editing of the contexts, *cf.* pp. 84, 142) evaluating the fifty-eight *ostraka* added to the four known in 1909 form the main expansion of the text. These new documents tend to confirm the author's conclusion that there was a considerable scattering of the votes at each *ostrakophoria*. Since, however, upwards of 300 *ostraka* have already (1935) been found, most of which are as yet unpublished, these pages will not remain long up-to-date. Carcopino's views on controversial points have been taken into account by many students who have discussed ostracism since 1909. I do not think that this literature can be disposed of by a general reference to the *Cambridge Ancient History* and Glotz's *Histoire grecque*.

On the ostracism of Thucydides the son of Melesias, for example, a reference to and discussion with Wade-Gery (Johns Hopkins University Studies, 1932, pp. 205 ff.) are surely desiderated. This is not the place to multiply instances. Carcopino's refusal to present and appraise the arguments used against him since his work was first published absolves us from the task. W. S. F.

T. R. Glover's *The World of the New Testament,* first published five years ago, has been reissued in a cheap edition (Cambridge, University Press; Macmillan, 1936, pp. 191, $1.50).

Articles: R. W. Hutchinson, *The Nineveh of Tacitus* (An. Archaeol. and Anthrop., XXI, nos. 3-4); P. Lemaire, *Crise et effondrement de la monarchie davidique* (Rev. Bibl., Apr.); M. R. Savignac, *Sur les pistes de Transjordanie meridionale* (*ibid.*); E. Herzfeld, *Die Religion der Achaemeniden* (Rev. Hist. Relig., Feb.); E. Gjerstad, *Studies in Archaic Greek Chronology* [I], *Naucratis* (An Archaeol. and Anthrop., XXI, nos. 3-4); H. C. Montgomery, *The Controversy about the Origin of the Olympic Games* (Class. Weekly, Apr. 27); A. W. Gomme, *Euboea and Samos in the Delian Confederacy* (Class. Rev., Feb.); B. D. Meritt, *A New Date in the Fifth Century* (Am. Jour. Philol., Apr.); H. N. Couch, *Some Political Implications of the Athenian Plague* (Trans. Am. Philol. Assoc., 1935); A. Momigliano, *Note sulla storia di Rodi* (Riv. Filol., Mar.); H. G. Robertson, *Plato as a Critic of Athens* (Class. Weekly, Mar. 30); U. Kahrstedt, *Das athenische Kontingent zum Alexanderzuge* (Hermes, LXXI, no. 1); W. Hoffmann, *Der Kampf zwischen Rom und Tarent im Urteil der antiken Überlieferung* (Hermes, LXXI, no. 1); F. Münzer, *Zu der Magistri von Minturnae* (Röm. Mitteil., L, nos. 3-4); T. R. S. Broughton, *On Two Passages of Cicero Referring to Local Taxes in Asia* (Am. Jour. Philol., Apr.); H. Marrou, *Défense de Cicéron* (Rev. Hist., Feb.); T. R. S. Broughton, *Some Non-Colonial Coloni of Augustus* (Trans. Am. Philol. Assoc., 1935); O. Brendel, *Novus Mercurius* (Röm. Mitteil., L, nos. 3-4); R. M. Geer, *The Greek Games at Naples* (Trans. Am. Philol. Assoc., 1935); W. Otto, *Zur Lebenszeit des P. Pomponius Secundus* (Philol., XC, no. 4); A. I. Suskin, *The Date of Tacitus' Proconsulship* (Am. Jour. Archaeol., Mar.); C. Roberts, T. C. Skeat, and A. D. Nock, *The Gild of Zeus Hypsistos* (Harv. Theol. Rev., Jan.); M. P. Charlesworth, *Providentia and Aeternitas* (*ibid.*).

T. R. S. B.

MEDIEVAL HISTORY

General review: Martin R. P. McGuire, *Medieval Studies in America* (Catholic Hist. Rev., Apr.).

Isis for May contains the forty-fifth critical bibliography of the history and philosophy of science and of the history of civilization, brought up to December, 1935.

Students of medieval German law and institutions will welcome the publication of Dr. Hermann Wiessner's detailed study of *Twing und Bann: Eine Studie über Herkunft, Wesen und Wandlung der Zwing- und Bannrechte* (Vienna, Rudolf M. Rohrer, 4 M.).

Das Bild Friedrich Barbarossas und seine Kaisertums (Emil Ebering, 1936), by Dr. Franz Böhm, forms Heft 289 of the Historische Studien. This is an important study of contemporary opinion concerning Frederick I. The first section considers the emperor as he is pictured in various twelfth century writings from France, England, Denmark, Bohemia, Hungary, Byzantium, Armenia, and Islamic lands. Part 2 deals with his position as emperor, his relations with the Church, and with Frederick as crusader. The author writes with a pleasing sense of style and presents his evidence convincingly. There is a short bibliography.

Professor August C. Krey's *A City that Art Built* (University of Minnesota Press, 1936, pp. 51) is an important essay which traces the rise and development of Florence in the Middle Ages, explaining also how the city became the vital center for artistic endeavor of every sort.

Articles: G. Bardy, *Faux et fraudes littéraires dans l'antiquité chrétienne* [concl'd] (Rev. Hist. Ecclés., Apr.); A. E. Giffard, *Études sur la procédure civile du Bas Empire* (Rev. Hist. Droit Fr. et Étr., Jan.); J. A. van Houtte, *Les courtiers au Moyen Age* (*ibid.*); D. B. Macdonald, *The Meanings of the Philosophy of al-Ghazzāli* (Isis, May); Walter Stach, *Die geschichtliche Bedeutung der westgotischen Reichsgründung* (Hist. Vierteljahr., Feb.); P. E. Schramm, *Der König von Frankreich: Wahl, Krönung, Erbfolge und Königsidee vom Anfang der Kapetinger (987) bis zum Ausgang des Mittelalters* (Zeitsch. Savigny-Stiftung f. Rechtsgesch., no. XXV, 1936); Erich Weniger, *Das deutsche Bildungswesen im Frühmittelalter* (Hist. Vierteljahr., Feb.); Ernst A. Philippson, *Die agrarische Religion der Germanen nach den Ergebnissen der nordischen Ortsnamenforschung* (Publ. Mod. Lang. Assoc., June); Dietrich von Gladiss, *Christentum und Hörigkeit in der Urkunden des fränkischen und deutschen Mittelalters* (Vierteljahr. f. Soz. und Wirtschaftsgesch., XXIX, no. 1); Alexander Miller, *Feudalism in England and Russia* (Slav. Rev., Apr.); J. E. A. Jolliffe, *A Survey of Fiscal Tenements* (Ec. Hist. Rev., Apr.); F. Wagner, *L'organisation du combat singulier au Moyen Age dans les États scandinaves et dans l'ancienne République islandaise* (Rev. Synthèse, Feb.); F. C. Hamil, *The King's Approvers* (Speculum, Apr.); Hilda Johnstone, *John De Ocle* (*ibid.*); C. R. Cheney, *The Punishment of Felonious Clerks* (Eng. Hist. Rev., Apr.); T. A. M. Bishop, *Monastic Granges in Yorkshire* (*ibid.*);H. G. Richardson, G. O. Sayles, *Early Coronation Records* [I] (Bull. Inst. Hist. Research, Feb.); Marjorie Blatcher, *Distress Infinite and the Contumacious Sheriff* (*ibid.*); A. Dopsch, *La naissance et la formation de l'État autrichien* (Rev. Hist., Jan.); Sture Bolin, *Folkun-*

garna [the Folkung dynasty] (Scandia, 1935, no. 2); Halvdan Koht, *Verknaden av unionen med Danmark paa det norske bondestande* [how the union with Denmark affected the Norwegian peasantry] (*ibid.*); Gottfrid Carlsson, *Arboga möte* [the diet of Arboga], *1435* (Hist. Tidskr., 1936, no. 1); Harry A. Wolfson, *Note on Maimonides' Classification of the Sciences* (Jewish Quar. Rev., XXVI); G. Mickwitz, *Un problème d'influence: Byzance et l'économie de l'Occident médiéval* (An. Hist. Éc. et Soc., Jan.); H. M. Smyser, *An Early Redaction of the Pseudo-Turpin* (Speculum, Apr.); George La Piana, *The Byzantine Theatre* (*ibid.*); Charles D. Matthews, *A Muslim Iconoclast* (*Ibn Taymiyyeh, d. 1328*) *on the 'Merits' of Jerusalem and Palestine* (Jour. Am. Oriental Soc., LVI, no. 1); Johanna Heydenreich, *Zu den Trierer Synodalstatuten des 13. Jahrhunderts* (Zeitsch Savigny-Stiftung f. Rechtsgesch., no. XXV, 1936); P. Pouzet, *Les origines lyonnaises de la secte des Vaudois* (Rev. Hist. de l'Église de France, Jan.); Arthur Bauhofer, *Zürich und die geistliche Gerichtsbarkeit* (Zeitsch. f. Schweizerische Gesch., XVI, no. 1); Heinrich Kramm, *Landschaftlicher Aufbau und Verschiebungen des deutschen Grosshandels am Beginn der Neuzeit, gemessen an den Familienverbindungen des Grossbürgertums* (Vierteljahr. f. Soz. und Wirtschaftsgesch., XXIX, no. 1); Giulio Battelli, *La 'Pecia' e la critica del testo dei manoscritti universitari medievali* (Arch. Stor. Ital. 1935, II, no. 2); Peter Karstedt, *Eine Erfurter Handschriftenwerkstatt im ausgehenden Mittelalter* (Zentralblatt f. Bibliothekswesen, Jan.); G. Mollat, *Les graces expectatives sous le règne de Philippe de Valois* (Rev. Hist. Ecclés., Apr.); Marcel Françon, *Petrarch, Disciple of Heraclitus* (Speculum, Apr.); Lynn Thorndike, *Another Manuscript of Leonard of Bertipaglia and John de Tracia* (Bull. Inst. of Medicine, Mar.).

Documents: Charles J. Liebman, jr., ed., *La consécration légendaire de la basilique de Saint-Denis* (Moyen Age, Oct.); Margaret Sharp, ed., *A Fragmentary Household Account of John of Gaunt* (Bull. Inst. Hist. Research, Feb.); E. Perroy, ed., *France, England, and Navarre from 1359-1364* (*ibid.*); Solomon Gandz, ed., *The Invention of the Decimal Fractions and the Application of the Exponential Calculus by Immanuel Bonfils of Tarascon, c. 1350* [Hebrew document; English translation] (Isis, May).

G. C. B.

FIFTEENTH AND SIXTEENTH CENTURIES

Bibliographie der Moderna Devotie (Nijmegen, N. V. Centrale Drukkerij, 1936, pp. 32, fl. 0.50), by J. M. E. Dols, is the first in a series of six sections, each of thirty-two pages, comprising a bibliography of the movement called *Devotio Moderna,* which in the course of the year 1937 will appear alphabetically arranged in one volume. The work is being done under the guidance of capable Roman Catholic scholars, especially the learned writer and educator, Dr. W. Mulder, S. J.

A. H.

Gustaf Adolf Lögdberg's study of the policies of the Northern kings in their dealings with the Teutonic Order is an important contribution to the history of the Baltic states and their problems in the fifteenth century (*De nordiska konungarna och tyska orden, 1441-1457*, Upsala, 1935, pp. xvii, 326).

Godes Peace and the Queenes: Vicissitudes of a House, 1539-1615 (Harvard University Press, 1934, pp. vi, 154, $2.50), by Norreys Jephson O'Conor, deals with the manor of Weston-on-the-Green, near Rycote, Oxfordshire, and with its owners and would-be owners during the sixteenth century. The manor was acquired by Lord Williams of Thame at the time of the dissolution of the monasteries and was left by him to his son-in-law, Henry Lord Norris of Rycote, at one time Elizabeth's ambassador in France. About 1588 it was claimed by Henry Clinton, earl of Lincoln, in the name of his wife whose first husband had been Lord Norris's eldest son. Lincoln, a most truculent and quarrelsome person, took the law into his own hands in 1589, led an armed raid upon the manor house at Weston, and forcibly seized the property. For this he was accused of riot and unlawful assembly before the Star Chamber and was sentenced to fine and imprisonment. The scope of the book is slight, but the author adds something to local and family history and makes good use of unpublished Star Chamber records. He has worked with care, but occasionally displays a lack of familiarity with the general history of the period and detracts from the clarity of his narrative by printing too many extracts from his sources. D. H. W.

Articles: R. Hennig, *Die These einer vorcolumbischen portugiesischen Geheimkenntnis von Amerika* (Hist. Vierteljahr., Feb.); Dietrich Kohl, *Zum Problem der vorkolumbischen Entdeckung Amerikas* (Hist. Zeitsch., Mar.); R. Hennig, *Atlantische Fabelinseln und Entdeckung Amerikas* (*ibid.*); Lynn Thorndike, *Astronomy at Paris around 1485* (Humanisme et Renaissance, Apr.); David Donoghue, *Coronado, Oñate, and Quivira* (Mid-America, Apr.); E. Vansteenberghe, *Quelques écrits de Jean Gerson* (Rev. Sciences Relig., Jan.); Karl Küp, *Ulrich von Richental's Chronicle of the Council of Constance* (Bull. New York Public Library, Apr.); R. J. Mitchell, *English Law Students at Bologna in the Fifteenth Century* (Eng. Hist. Rev., June); M. Esposito, *Une secte d'hérétiques à Medina del Campo en 1459* (Rev. Hist. Ecclés., Apr.); J. Saltmarsh, *A College Home-Farm in the Fifteenth Century* (Ec. Hist., Feb.); R. D. Richards, *The Exchequer Bill in English Government Finance* (*ibid.*); Étienne Bougoüin, *Nantes port du sel au XV^e siècle: De la légende à l'enquête* (An. Hist. Éc. et Soc., Mar.); É. Coornaert, *La genèse du système capitaliste: Grand capitalisme et économie traditionnelle à Anvers au XVI^e siècle* (*ibid.*); Daniel Sargent, *The Trial of Sir Thomas More* (Catholic Hist. Rev., Apr.); Giovanni Sforza, *Riflessi della Controriforma nella Repubblica di Venezia* [VII, VIII] (Arch. Stor. Ital., 1935, II, no. 2); H. J. Byrom, *Some Ex-*

chequer Cases involving Members of the Book Trade, 1534-1558 (Library, Mar.); W. J. Harte, *Some Recent Views on Drake's Voyage Round the World* [Historical Revision, no. LXXVI] (History, Mar.).

Documents: Abbé Legros, ed., *Le "Thrésor de l'Esglise Parroichial Nostre-Dame d'Alenczon" à la fin de l'occupation anglaise* [II] (Rev. Ques. Hist., Mar.).

SEVENTEENTH AND EIGHTEENTH CENTURIES

Vol. VIII of the *Sources de l'Histoire de France, XVII^e siècle, 1610-1715* (Auguste Picard, 1936, pp. xx, 414, 60 fr.), which has just appeared, completes this important section of the still larger work.

The Baptist Historical Society, through the Kingsgate Press, has reproduced in facsimile *The Mystery of Iniquity,* by Thomas Helwys (1612). The Replika process has been used, and the copy reproduced is now in the Bodleian Library. It was presented by Helwys to King James.

A Brief Introduction to the Bibliography of Modern Jewish History, by Jacob R. Marcus, has been issued as Publication No. 16 by the Hebrew Union College of Cincinnati. It is in mimeographed form, and embodies about one thousand items dealing with the subject from 1650 to the present time.

In *The Lady of Bleeding Heart Yard, Lady Elizabeth Hatton, 1576-1646* (Harcourt, Brace) Laura Norsworthy makes a serious though naturally a sympathetic attempt to marshal facts to do belated justice to characters that have suffered somewhat in history because associated with such figures as Bacon, Coke, and Buckingham. Lady Hatton was a granddaughter of Burghley; she had for her first husband Sir William Newport, a nephew of Sir Christopher Hatton, before she became the second spouse of Coke. Her daughter became unwillingly the unhappy wife of Buckingham's brother.

W. T. L.

Der deutsche Libertätsgedanke und die Politik Wilhelms III. von Oranien [Das Reich und Mitteleuropa, I] (Berlin, Ferd. Dümmler, 1935, pp. 174, 5.50 M.), by Dr. Paulina Havelaar, is based on the essential primary sources (both published and unpublished), contemporary pamphlets, and most of the best secondary accounts. Guided by Professor Martin Spahn of the University of Cologne and the eminent Dutch archivist, Dr. N. Japikse, the author has made a valuable contribution to the relation between the Dutch Republic and Germany from 1672 to 1688. German historians obviously do not study this period with great avidity, while Dutch writers have persistently ignored the subject in question, since their attention is directed more to the Anglo-Dutch relations. Miss Havelaar reveals that William III was very anxious to secure allies in Germany but that he was generally preoccupied with political and religious affairs in England. His policy was defen-

sive, and he attempted to persuade several German princes to join him in a defensive alliance against France. However, until 1685 he was hampered by the provincial estates in his own country and by the Great Elector. We may gather that such terms as "The War of the League of Augsburg" and "The War of the Palatinate", still widely used in this country, do not properly describe the war which William III inaugurated in 1688. Miss Havelaar has made a good beginning, and it is to be hoped that she will study the works of Legrelle and Turba, and in her next monograph will put the long Dutch extracts in the footnotes and the German translations in the text. A. H.

Of more than passing interest is a recently published account by Frans G. Bengtsson of the earlier years of the life and military career of Charles XII (*Karl XII:s levnad till uttåget ur Sachsen,* Stockholm, 1935, pp. 267). The author has drawn on considerable bodies of materials hitherto little known and has produced a narrative that is almost epic in character. The work closes with the king's departure from Saxony in 1707. L. M. L.

In the "Notes" of the April *Bulletin* of the Huntington Library is published a collection of "Letters from James Brydges, created Duke of Chandos, to Henry St. John, created Viscount Bolingbroke". They run from 1707 to 1730. There is an introduction by Godfrey Davies and Marion Tinling.

Ancients and Moderns: a Study of the Background of the "Battle of the Books" (Washington University Studies, 1936, pp. x, 358), by Professor Richard Foster Jones, originally published fifteen years ago, has now been reissued in an enlarged edition.

Sir Charles Petrie's *The Four Georges* (Houghton Mifflin) is most substantial in the passages allotted to the Jacobite rebellions. The rest of the book is too thin to merit the attention of serious readers.

Vol. XXXV, *Mémoires et Documents* of the Société d'histoire et d'archéologie of Geneva is devoted to the additions and corrections which Émile Rivoire has made for his *Bibliographie historique de Genève au XVIII^e siècle,* published in 1897.

Dr. Martin Göhring, who gives us a monograph on *Rabaut Saint-Etienne, ein Kämpfer an der Wende zweier Epochen* (Historische Studien, Heft 279, Berlin, Ebering, 1935, pp. 261) has selected for his theme the life and ideas of a typical representative of the men of 1789. There was a time when his reputation ranked above that of Mirabeau, who was ridiculed by some as a "demi-Rabaut" or a "Mi-Rabaut". He stands with Grégoire and Gerle as one of the trio in the foreground of David's representation of the tennis-court oath. The election of this Protestant pastor as President of the Assembly revived religious antagonisms in southern France. His membership on the Constitutional Committee gave him a share in the formation of that bourgeois limited monarchy in which he believed. His later evolution into a republican

with Girondin affiliations and advanced views on social equality came under the Convention, in which he played a less significant role. Not the least valuable side of this study is the painstaking analysis of Rabaut's writings with the purpose of tracing the development of his thought as typical of the evolution in the thinking of his contemporaries. Rabaut stands out in the end as a purehearted patriot, ethical in emphasis, pedagogical in spirit, liberal and nationalistic in politics, but not original or profound in ideas. E. N. C.

Articles: Alexander Thomson, *John Holles* (Jour. Mod. Hist., June); P. Geyl, *Johan de Witt, Grand Pensionary of Holland, 1653-1672* (History, Mar.); H. F. Buffet, *La traité des noirs et le commerce de l'argent au Port-Louis et à Lorient sous Louis XIV* (Rev. Études Hist., Oct.); A. du Boisrouvray, *Un exemple de l'esprit commercial des français sous l'ancien régime: "La Nation française de Cadix" aux XVIII^e siècle* (Rev. Ques. Hist., Mar.); J. M. Scammell, *Warfare in the Eighteenth Century* [III] (Infantry Jour., Mar.; Field Artillery Jour., Mar.); Émile de Perceval, *Denise de Montesquieu ou comment on se mariait au XVIII^e siècle* (Rev. Études Hist., Jan.); G. E. Fussell and Constance Goodman, *Eighteenth-Century Traffic in Live-Stock* (Ec. Hist., Feb.); S. Stuart Sutherland, *Sir G. Colebroke's Corner in Alum, 1771-1773* (*ibid.*); E. Hughes, *Excise Salaries and a Cost of Living Index, 1795-1800* (*ibid.*); N. E. Himes, *Bentham and the Genesis of Neo-Malthusianism* (*ibid.*); Sidney L. Gulick, jr., *The Publication of Chesterfield's Letters to his Son* (Publ. Mod. Lang. Assoc., Mar.); A. Mathiez, *Pacifisme et Nationalisme au XVIII^e siècle* [written in 1931 or 1932] (An. Hist. Rév. Fr., Jan.); J. Godechot, *Les aventures d'un fournisseur aux armées: Hanet-Cléry* (*ibid.*); Louis Jacob, *La Grande Peur de 1789, en Artois* (*ibid.*, Mar.); Louis Gottschalk, *Quelques études récentes sur Marat* (*ibid.*); André Latreille, *Le Saint-Siège et les Constitutionnels, d'après un ouvrage récent* (Rév. Fr., Rev. Hist. Cont., 1936, no. 1); F. Braesch, *Les Massacres de Septembre* [apropos of Pierre Caron's volume] (*ibid.*); R. Schneider, *Le portrait pendant la Révolution* (*ibid.*); Edouard Chapuisat, *La Révolution française et la Suisse: Les grandes opérations militaires de 1798 à l'Acte de médiation* (*ibid.*); Edmond Soreau, *Sur les ouvriers au l'an IV, notamment à Saint-Gobain* (Rev. Études Hist., Jan.); Maurice de La Fuye, *Rostoptchine, chancelier du Tsar Paul I^er* (Rev. Hist. Dipl., Jan.).

HISTORY SINCE 1800

General review: *Justus Hashagen: La documentation de guerre en Allemagne* (Rev. Hist. Guerre Mond., Jan.).

In *Peter Porcupine: a Study of William Cobbett, 1762-1835* (Longmans) Marjorie Bowen does not pretend to offer new information on her subject; she aspires merely "to reduce to their simplest elements the problems that vexed Cobbett and his contemporaries". But it is doubtful whether she ac-

quired sufficient information and understanding to enable her to proceed with a helpful simplification. W. T. L.

The monumental *Histoire de la Nation égyptienne,* edited by Gabriel Hanotaux, has reached vol. VI, which includes two parts, indicated by the subtitles *L'Égypte de 1801 à 1882,* by F. Charles Roux, and *Le Soudain égyptien de Mohamed Aly à Ismaïl Pasha,* by Henri Dehéran.

Europe: the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Eras (Longmans, 1935, pp. viii, 187, $1.75), by A. J. Grant and Harold Temperley, is a reprint from Part I of *Europe in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries,* by the same authors, with an "Epilogue" dealing with the settlement of 1815, with certain side glances at the Treaty of Versailles of 1919, by way of comparison. These are so few, however, that the reader is left wishing for more.

New light is thrown on the development of the Swedish-Norwegian union in its formative years by the publication of Bernadotte's correspondence with his friend Karl Otto Mörner, a collection of letters that have thus far been used only in part. The correspondence is edited by Sofie Aubert Lundbaek (*Karl Johans brev till riksståthållaren Mörner, 1816-1818,* Stockholm, 1935, pp. x, 192). L. M. L.

Kurt M. Hoffman's *Preussen und die Julimonarchie, 1830-1834* (Berlin, 1936) is chiefly concerned with the role of Prussia in Metternich's successful attempt to draw the three Eastern powers together during and after the Revolutions of 1830. It is based on memoirs of the period, on the secondary works, including the most recent, and on materials in the Berlin archives. The account might have been more balanced had the French and Austrian archives been consulted. While chiefly concerned with Franco-Prussian relations, this carefully done monograph throws much light on the whole international situation 1830-1834. F. B. A.

The current issue of the *Danish Historisk Tidsskrift* (1936, no. 3, pp. 335-412) has an extended article by Georg Nörregaard on the sale of the Danish possessions in India and on the Guinea coast in 1845 and 1850. The author finds that Denmark was glad to sell, since her overseas possessions had ceased to be a source of profit. The stations in India brought more than they were actually worth; the Guinea forts, on the other hand, were sold at a very low price. L. M. L.

Dr. Gustav Mayer's noteworthy life of Friedrich Engels, the German edition of which in two volumes was reviewed in this journal last year (XL, 505-507) by the late Dr. William F. Notz, has been made available to the English reading public under the title *Friedrich Engels: a Biography* (Knopf, 1936, pp. xii, 332, xii, $3.50), translated by Gilbert and Helen Hichet, and edited by R. H. S. Crossman. There is an introduction by G. D. H. Cole.

The two volumes entitled *Russia in Northeastern Asia,* vol. I, *Northern*

Colonization, its Past and Present, vol. II, *Northern Resources, their Exploitation and Development* [titles translated] (Peiping, 1933; 1934, pp. ix, 185; ix, 202), by J. J. Gapanovich, are doubly valuable, as they are excellent, and as the literature about Russia in Siberia is scarce. The author treats both the history of conquest and the methods of exploitation of Northeastern Asia as a separate chapter in Russia's penetration into Siberia and to the Pacific Ocean. In this treatment the reviewer concurs wholeheartedly. Northeastern Asia is in fact a Russian colony. The author presents valuable material, much of which he himself had obtained on the spot. A brief résumé and a table of contents in English in each volume are helpful to a reader who is not very familiar with the Russian language. The author's pessimistic view, however, that Northeastern Asia may be lost to Russia as the result of becoming a bone of contention between Japan and the United States is not shared by the reviewer. A fairly complete index at the end of each volume adds to the value of the work. L. I. S.

Professor Walter Consuelo Langsam's *The World since 1914* (Macmillan, pp. xvi, 888, $3.50) has appeared in a third edition, its chapters rewritten and a new chapter added dealing with Latin America.

Dr. Michael T. Florinsky has added another of his illuminating interpretations of recent political phenomena in *Fascism and National Socialism: a Study of the Economic and Social Policies of the Totalitarian State* (Macmillan, 1936, pp. x, 292, $2.50).

Articles: J. Holland Rose, *The Royal Navy and the Suppression of the West African Slave Trade* [II] (Mariner's Mirror, Apr.); Maurice de La Fuye, *Rostoptchine et Koutousov, Moscou 1812* (Rev. Ques. Hist., Mar.); André Gain, *Le programme contre-révolutionnaire d'un gentilhomme bourguignon, 1815* (An. Est, 1936, no. 1); P. O. von Törne, *Sällskapet Wallhall och självständighetsidén i Finland* [the Walhalla Society and the plans for Finnish autonomy] (Hist. Tidskr. för Finland, 1935, nos. 3-4); Paul Sweet, *Friedrich von Gentz and the Danubian Principalities: a Sidelight on Austria's Eastern Policy in the Age of Metternich* (Birmingham-Southern Coll. Bull., Nov.); A. J. Svolos, *L'influence des idées de la Révolution française sur les Constitutions helléniques de la Guerre d'Indépendance* (Rév. Fr., Rev. Hist. Cont., 1935, no. 4); Francis Waddington, *La question des frontières grecques* (Rev. Hist. Dipl., Jan.); G. H. Bolsover, *Palmerston and Metternich on the Eastern Question in 1834* (Eng. Hist. Rev., Apr.); Inna Lubimenko, *Un academicien russe à Paris* (Rev. Hist. Mod., Nov.); Guy F. Hershberger, *Some Religious Pacifists of the Nineteenth Century* (Mennonite Quar. Rev., Jan.); Lucie Varga, *Dans une vallée du Vorarlberg: d'avant-hier à aujourd'hui* (An. Hist. Éc. et Soc., Jan.); John King Fairbank, *The Definition of the Foreign Inspectorate of Customs at Shanghai, 1854-1855* (Nankai Soc. and Ec. Quar., Apr.); Maxwell R. Kelso, *The Inception of the Modern French*

Labor Movement, 1871-1879: a Reappraisal (Jour. Mod. Hist., June); Viktor August Wroblewski, *Lamsdorff über Deutschland und seine Zukunft* (Berl. Monatsh., May); Raymond Beazley, *Campbell Bannerman and Peace Opportunities, 1905-1907* (*ibid.*, Apr.); Maurice Schultz, *La politique économique d'Aehrenthal envers la Serbie* [II] (Rev. Hist. Guerre Mond., Jan.); Rudolf Kiszling, *Die Mobilmachung der europäischen Mächte im Sommer 1914: Österreich-Ungarn* (Berl. Monatsh., Mar.).

Documents: Howard R. Marraro, ed., *Two Unpublished Letters of Giuseppe Mazzini* (Jour. Mod. Hist., June); *L'intervention des alliés à Murmansk, mars-avril, 1918* (Rev. Hist. Guerre Mond., Jan.).

UNITED STATES

GENERAL

General review: Henry Steele Commager, *The Literature of American History, 1935* (Social Studies, Apr., May); Bernadotte E. Schmitt, *American Neutrality, 1914-1917* (Jour. Mod. Hist., June).

Among recent accessions to the Division of Manuscripts in the Library of Congress the following may be noted: 22 papers of John Amory, Jonathan Amory, and Thomas Amory, 1705-1787; 23 papers of Andrew Ellicott and David Gillespie, 1777-1801; about 304 additional papers of the Society of the Cincinnati, 1784-1936; photostats of 90 papers of Captain James Sever, U. S. N., 1794-1801; daybook of Samuel Davidson of Georgetown, D. C., 1801-1810; many additional papers of General Thomas S. Jesup, 1810-1859; letter book of Andrew Jackson, 1829-1831; journal and notes of Levi Hayden of a voyage from Boston to Manila, etc., 1840-1843; photostats of 109 papers of "Stonewall" Jackson, 1845-1860; journal of Daniel H. Smith of a voyage from Newburyport to San Francisco, 1849-1850; papers of Mary Abigail Dodge ("Gail Hamilton"), 1856-1877; long letter of Mrs. Jefferson Davis, June 6, 1865, respecting Davis's capture; papers of John Sharp Williams, several thousands; and some thousands of additional photocopies from London, Paris, and Seville.

The National Archives announces the promotion of Dr. Philip M. Hamer to be Chief of the Division of the Library and of Mr. Arthur H. Leavitt and Mr. Fred W. Shipman to be chiefs of divisions of department archives. All of them were formerly deputy examiners in the Division of Accessions. Mr. Reed N. Haythorne, Mr. Herman Kahn, Mr. Robert H. Bahmer, and Mr. Oliver W. Holmes have been appointed deputy examiners; Dr. W. Neil Franklin, special examiner; Dr. W. D. McCain, assistant classifier; Miss Edna Vosper, associate reference supervisor; Dr. Vernon G. Setser, assistant reference supervisor; and Mr. Herbert E. Angel, assistant to the Director of Publications.

The inactive pension records of soldiers, sailors, and marines in all the wars of the United States and in the regular Army and Navy from 1815 to, but not including, the World War and of the dependents of such service men have been transferred from the Veterans' Administration to the National Archives. This collection of over 40,000 cubic feet of papers includes applications, briefs of service records, medical histories, supporting affidavits, birth, marriage, and death certificates, correspondence, and miscellaneous papers relating to over 4,000,000 individuals. Other material recently transferred includes records of the United States Board of Mediation and Conciliation, 1898-1920, labor records of the United States Railroad Administration, 1918-1920, and records of the United States Railroad Labor Board, 1920-1926, from the National Mediation Board (1420 cubic feet); and the original files of presidential proclamations, 1791 to date, of executive orders, 1862 to date, and of administrative orders of the National Recovery Administration, 1934-1935, together with the registers and indexes for these files, from the Department of State (57 cubic feet).

Volumes XXXII and XXXIII of the *Journals of the Continental Congress,* covering the transactions of the year 1787, have lately been published by the Government Printing Office. The thirty-fourth and last volume, covering the transactions of 1788 and 1789, is in page proof, waiting for the making of the index.

Dr. Edward E. Everett has added to the "Bibliographical Contributions" of the Department of Agriculture a classified list of annotated references on *George Washington and Agriculture.*

The Huntington Library has begun the experiment of issuing separately the "check lists" of books or manuscripts in its collections instead of simply inserting them in the *Library Bulletin.* The initial number in the new series is a *Check List of American Laws, Charters, and Constitutions of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries in the Huntington Library* (pp. vii, 140, $1.00), compiled by Willard O. Waters.

Two of the recent accessions to the Franco-American Pamphlet series are (No. 6) *Fleury in the American Revolution,* by Le Roy Elwood Kimball, of New York University, and (No. 7) *The Burned Letter of Chastellux,* by Randolph G. Adams, director of the William L. Clements Library.

The First American Neutrality: a Study of the American Understanding of Neutral Obligations during the years 1792 to 1815, by Charles S. Hyneman [Illinois Studies in the Social Sciences] (University of Illinois, 1934, pp. 178, $2.50), is a complex, heavily documented series of case studies under several aspects of the problem. Mr. Hyneman cites popular sympathies for one or the other belligerent, French hopes of special benevolence pursuant to the commercial treaty of 1778, the lack of statutory law, and the shortcomings of the administrative system as the chief deterrents upon the

free operation of agreed official policy. National commercial interests stand out as the governing factor both in the formulation and carrying out of theories. As in most previous diplomatic studies of the period, the interesting complexities arising from our relations with Spain are slighted. The bibliography appears somewhat weak in strictly historical works, notably absent being Hunter Miller's new treaty series and the works of Samuel Flagg Bemis on Jay's and Pinckney's treaties. P. C. B.

American Diplomatic and Consular Practice (Appleton-Century, 1936, pp. xi, 560, $5.00), by Professor Graham H .Stuart, is a handbook of the organization and functioning of the Department of State and its service at home and abroad, with a historical description of the department and its various divisions. There is also an analysis of the control of foreign relations in the United States. It resembles more a set of thorough professorial lectures to college students, with occasional use of vernacular expressions and figures of speech, than it does a classic treatise on diplomatic practice of the type of Satow. It will be a useful compendium for students and practitioners of American diplomacy, and an interesting revelation for foreign readers.

Two studies in American Church history have recently been added to the publications of the Catholic University of America: *French Catholic Missionaries in the Present United States, 1604-1791,* by Sister Mary Doris Mulvey, O.P., M.A., and *The Secularization of the California Missions, 1810-1846,* by the Rev. Gerald J. Geary, A.M.

Letters of Robert E. Lee to Henry Kayser, 1838-1846, make up nos. 1 and 2 of vol. III, *Glimpses of the Past,* published by the Missouri Historical Society. They arose from Lee's appointment to make surveys of the Mississippi at St. Louis for the protection of the city's harbor.

A third edition of Professor Louis Martin Sears's *History of American Foreign Relations* (Crowell, 1936, pp. xiv, 706, $3.50) has followed the second within a year. In it the author has continued the treatment of questions raised during Mr. Roosevelt's presidency into the spring of the present year.

This book, *My Friend, Julia Lathrop* (Macmillan, 1935, pp. ix, 228, $2.00), by the late Jane Addams, was written with unusual understanding, for there "was an almost striking similarity in the early experiences" of these friends. It gives an account of Julia Lathrop's life to her appointment to the Children's Bureau in 1912 and of her last ten years in Illinois after her return from Washington. Grace Abbott is to write of Julia Lathrop's work in Washington and her services on the League of Nations Commission. In this biography we are given an insight into the background, the work, and especially the spirit of a great leader of social reform. E. D. S.

The emphasis of O. W. Riegel in *Crown of Glory: the Life of James J.*

Strang, Moses of the Mormons (Yale University Press, 1935, pp. 281, $3.00) is on the man rather than on the movement—the latter has been thoroughly handled in M. M. Quaife's *The Kingdom of St. James* (*Am. Hist. Rev.*, XXXVI, 418), to which Mr. Riegel acknowledges his indebtedness. The point of view of the biographer toward his subject is given in the dedication of the volume "To James Jesse Strang, whose failure was magnificent". In spite of this attitude of the author, Strang seems both pathetic and absurd, but never magnificent. The author emphasizes the "inner emotional life" and this has led him "in a few instances to interpret from the subjective point of view the somewhat meager documentation" (p. 274). This type of history seems to be carried rather far (pp. 4-5) when the mind of a baby of seventeen months is interpreted. "Long weary days he sat upon the floor, thinking, a cheerless Buddha in baby clothes. . . . He was thinking, thinking, thinking. His tiny precocious soul brooded day after day upon the mystery of its own being". E. D. S.

With questions of local government so important, a distinct service is rendered by such a work as *State and Local Government in the United States* (Crofts, 1936, pp. 351, $2.80), by W. S. Carpenter and P. T. Stafford.

In *The Interstate Commerce Commission: a Study in Administrative Law and Procedure*, Part III, Volume B (Commonwealth Fund, 1936, pp. xiv, 833, $5.00), Professor I. F. Sharfman devotes his attention to that part of the Commission's activity which centers upon rate regulation. The magnitude no less than the difficulty of the task of analyzing and summarizing almost a half century of administrative work embodied in over two hundred volumes of reports may well be imagined. Professor Sharfman has here brought to bear the same full knowledge and judicial appraisal which have marked the three previous volumes. He divides his subject into rate regulations that affected the general rate level, and those that have affected the rate structure, using a host of individual cases as illustrative. After a recital of the more famous general rate advance proceedings of 1910, 1914, 1915, and 1917 he pronounces the verdict that:

> Despite the absence before 1920 of any legislative mandate with reference to financial returns, it has seemed fair, without undue reliance upon the advantages of retrospection, to conclude that during the few years immediately preceding war-time administration of the carriers the Commission failed to allow adequately for the rising costs of railroad administration and the accumulating difficulties of providing efficient service (pp. 304-305).

Decisions in similar cases, after the rule of rate making was incorporated into the law, he views in a more favorable light. The series of decisions aimed at defining the Fourth Section of the Act, those seeking to eliminate discrimination in transportation charges, and those creating the new distance scale structures are assessed with objective fairness and understanding. One of

the sagest dicta in the volume, based on his realization of the ever-shifting industrial structure, is a concluding observation: "The continuing need of regulation is a sign, not that the Commission has failed to do its work, but that its work, in its very nature, is never done". W. M. D.

A curious phase of American social history in the latter part of the nineteenth century is illustrated in the *Journal of Jay Cooke or the Gibraltar Records, 1865-1905* (Ohio State University Press, 1935, pp. ix, 359), edited by James E. Pollard. Gibraltar is one of the islands in western Lake Erie immortalized by Commodore Perry. Jay Cooke, the well-known financier, acquired it in 1864, and in 1925 it came into the possession of the Ohio State University. The "Records" were kept by Jay Cooke, his family, and his guests over a long period of years.

Articles: R. D. W. Connor, *Our National Archives* (Minnesota History, Mar.); J. M. Clark, *Past Accomplishments and Present Prospects of American Economics* [a review of fifty years of accomplishment] (Am. Ec. Rev., Mar.); John A. Zvetina, *The Judiciary Act of 1789—a Stepping Stone in National Development* (Mid-America, Apr.); Charles W. Smith, jr., *Roger B. Taney and Mr. Biddle's Bank* (Maryland Hist. Mag., Mar.); Charles W. Ramsdell, *Some Problems involved in writing the History of the Confederacy* (jour. Southern Hist., May); Kirkwood Mitchell, *Lee and the Bullet of the Civil War* (William and Mary Coll. Quar., Jan.); Lyon G. Tyler, *Jefferson Davis* (Tyler's Quar. Hist. and Geneal. Mag., Apr.); William C. Macleod, *The Truth about Lotteries in American History* (South Atlantic Quar., Apr.); Carter Goodrich and Sol Davison, *The Wage-Earner in the Westward Movement* [II] (Pol. Sci. Quar., Mar.); Avrahm Yarmolinsky, *Bibliographical Studies in Early Polish America* [V] (Bull. New York Public Library, May); Edward F. Goss, *The Taft Commission to the Vatican, 1902* (Rec. Am. Catholic Hist. Soc., Dec.).

Documents: Joseph E. Johnson, ed., *A Quaker Imperialist's View of the British Colonies in America, 1732* (Pennsylvania Mag. Hist. and Biog., Apr.); Bernhard A. Uhlendorf and Edna Vosper, eds., *Letters of Major Baurmeister during the Philadelphia Campaign, 1777-1778* [III] (*ibid.*); John Pickering, ed., *Washington's Narrative of the Braddock Campaign, from the Original Autograph Manuscript of Washington* (Essex Inst. Hist. Coll., Jan.); Charles R. Wilson, ed., *The Original Chase Organization and "The Next Presidential Election"* (Miss. Valley Hist. Rev., June).

NEW ENGLAND, MIDDLE COLONIES AND STATES

The *Proceedings* of the American Antiquarian Society at the meeting of October, 1934, just issued, contain a facsimile reproduction of Ebenezer Cooke's *The Maryland Muse* (Annapolis, 1731), with an interesting introduction by Lawrence C. Wroth on Cooke, his *Sot-weed Factor,* his elegy on

the death of Nicholas Lowe, his *Sot-weed Redivivus,* and his rhymed history of Bacon's Rebellion; also an article on the libraries of the Presidents of the United States, with reproductions of bookplates, by Dr. A. S. W. Rosenbach (also issued separately), and a reprint of Daniel Hewett's list of newspapers and periodicals of the United States in 1828. The *Proceedings* for the meeting of 1935 have also been issued, together with *A Check List of New England Election Sermons,* prepared by R. G. W. Vail.

As the New England Puritan is not commonly contemplated with sympathy by the Continental mind all the greater interest attaches to the attempt made by Pierre Brodin in *Quelques aspects de la vie religieuse en Nouvelle-Angleterre au dix-septième siècle* (Bédu, 1935, pp. 59) to avoid the exaggerations of the popular school of hostile critics as well as the traditional eulogies in discussing a highly controversial subject. He has based his appreciations upon a careful study of contemporary documents.

The Drama of Concord: a Pageant of Three Centuries, by Allen French, was given at the Tercentenary Celebration of the incorporation of that historic town. The author's name is a guarantee of the value of this interpretation.

George C. S. Benson has made an interesting analysis in *The Administration of the Civil Service in Massachusetts, with special reference to State Control of City Civil Service* (Harvard University Press, 1935, pp. xiv, 90). Massachusetts is the only state in which is found judicial review of removals, and one of the two states in which the state government administers local civil service. The author has found two forces which militate against the intelligent administration of the law: the efforts of civil service groups to secure laws to entrench themselves in their offices, and the friction caused by state administration of local civil service. E. P.

The Long Island Historical Society has rendered a valuable service in publishing a *Catalogue of American Genealogies in its Library* (Brooklyn, the Society, 1935, pp. 660). The volume has been prepared under the direction of the Librarian, Emma Toedteberg. The number of items is 8202. In addition there is a "List of Manuscripts" and blueprint material numbering 849 items.

Two features of the Long Island Tercentenary Celebration have rendered a service to the study of local history. These are exhibitions of early American antiquities in the Brooklyn building of the Long Island Historical Society and in the new Nassau County Police Building in Mineola. In the Mineola exhibit is a particularly interesting collection of Dutch and English devotional books and scriptures from 1684 and documents from 1670. One salutary effect already is the reorganization of the old county historical society.

Articles: Matt Bushnell Jones, *Thomas Maule, the Salem Quaker, and Free Speech in Massachusetts Bay, with Bibliographical Notes* (Essex Inst.

Hist. Coll., Jan.); Theodore Hornberger, *The Science of Thomas Prince* (New Eng. Quar., Mar.); Roy F. Nichols, *William Shaler, New England Apostle of Rational Liberty* (*ibid.*); Donald L. Jacobus, *Irish in New England before 1700* (New Eng. Hist. and Geneal. Reg., Apr.); Richard J. Quinlan, *Growth and Development of Education in the Archdiocese of Boston* (Catholic Hist. Rev., Apr.); Allan W. Forbes, *Apprenticeship in Massachusetts: its Early Importance and Later Neglect* (Worcester Hist. Soc. Publ., Apr.); E. P. Alexander, *James Duane* (New York Hist., Apr.); Harry Yoshpe, *The DeLancey Estate: Did the Revolution democratize Landholding in New York?* (*ibid.*); Samuel Rezneck, *A Schoolboy of 1830* (*ibid.*); Fulmer Mood, *English Publicity Broadsides for West New Jersey* (Proc. New Jersey Hist. Soc., Jan.); Wheaton J. Lane, *The Turnpike Movement in New Jersey* (*ibid.*); Cornelius C. Vermeule, *Raritan Landing that Was: the History of a River Port from 1675 to 1875* (*ibid.*, Apr.); Fulmer Mood, *William Penn and English Politics in 1680-1681: New Light on the Granting of the Pennsylvania Charter* (Jour. Friends' Hist. Soc., Dec.); Leonidas Dodson, *Pennsylvania through the Eyes of a Royal Governor* (Pennsylvania Hist., Apr.); Frederic K. Miller, *The Farmer at Work in Colonial Pennsylvania* (*ibid.*); Elizabeth K. Henderson, *The Northwestern Lands of Pennsylvania, 1790-1812* (Pennsylvania Mag. Hist. and Biog., Apr.); Sister M. St. Henry, I. H. M., *Nativism in Pennsylvania, with Particular Regard to its Effect on Politics and Education, 1840-1860* (Rec. Am. Catholic Hist. Soc., Mar.); Solon J. Buck, *Frontier Economy in Southwestern Pennsylvania* (Agricultural Hist., Jan.); John W. Harpster, *Eighteenth-Century Inns and Taverns of Western Pennsylvania* (Western Pennsylvania Hist. Mag., Mar.); Edgar Legare Pennington, *The Church in Delaware* (Hist. Mag. Protestant Episcopal Church, Mar.).

Documents: Raymond P. Stearns, ed., *Letters and Documents by or relating to Hugh Peter* [cont'd] (Essex Inst. Hist. Coll., Jan.); Charles K. Bolton, ed., *A Journey to Maine in 1859: a Diary of Charles Edward Bolton* (New Eng. Quar., Mar.).

SOUTHERN COLONIES AND STATES

The Vestry Book of Blisland [*Blissland*] *Parish, New Kent and James City Counties* (Richmond, the Library Board, 1935, pp. xlii, 277), transcribed and edited by C. G. Chamberlayne, embodies the earliest extant record book of this parish in Virginia. It is of great value not only in itself but also because the original records before 1865 of the two counties in which the parish lies, have been lost. While the minutes of the vestry are replete with the usual routine duties of the parish, of special interest are the erection of the brick church in the lower part of the parish and the brick addition to the upper church, described in detail; the improvements in the glebe houses; the numbering of tobacco plants according to law in order to better the staple; and

some casual entries indicating the effect of the American Revolution, such as the calling out of the militia, the dissolution of the old vestry in 1778, and the delay in taking the list of titles in 1781 because of "the interruption of the English Army". Dr. C. G. Chamberlayne has written a scholarly introduction concerning the boundaries and history of the parish. In his account of the participation of this area in Bacon's Rebellion, he has included some informative documents, hitherto unpublished, from the Public Record Office, London. Among the illustrations is a copy of part of the tidewater area of the Fry and Jefferson Map of Virginia (1775 ed.). Dr. Chamberlayne has provided a thorough index and has maintained the high standards of editorial and historical scholarship of his two earlier volumes in this series of the Virginia State Library. This is the fifteenth original parish record of Virginia to be published. L. J. C.

It is fitting that a town so historic as Lexington, with its memories of the Virginia Military Institute, of Stonewall Jackson, and of Robert E. Lee, should be the subject of a memorial volume *Lexington in Old Virginia* (Richmond, Garrett and Massie, 1936, pp. xii, 235, $3.00), by Henry Boley. It is fully illustrated.

Articles: E. Merton Coulter, *What the South has done about its History* (Jour. Southern Hist., Feb.); Laurence F. Hill, *The Confederate Exodus to Latin America* [III] (Southwestern Hist. Quar., Apr.); Hubert Searcy, *Congressional Redistricting in the Solid South* (Birmingham-Southern Coll. Bull., XXIX, no. 3); Charles A. Barker, *Property Rights in the Provincial System of Maryland: Proprietary Policy; Proprietary Revenues* (Jour. Southern Hist., Feb., May); Paul H. Giddens, *Bibliography of Maryland during the Time of Governor Horatio Sharpe, 1753-1769* (Maryland Hist. Mag., Mar.); William Allen Pusey, *General Joseph Martin, an Unsung Hero of the Virginia Frontier* (Filson Club Hist. Quar., Apr.); *Edmund Randolph's Essay on the History of Virginia* [cont'd] (Virginia Mag. Hist. and Biog., Apr.); Josephine Pinckney, *The Marchant of London* (Virginia Quar. Rev., Apr.); O. F. Northington, jr., *Revival of the Iron Industry in Eastern Virginia as exemplified in the History of the Catharine Furnace in Spotsylvania County* (William and Mary Coll. Quar., Jan.); Elizabeth H. Ryland, *Paul Micou, Chyrurgeon* [1658-1736] (*ibid.*, Apr.); Robert W. Eaves, *A History of the Educational Developments of Alexandria, Virginia, prior to 1860* [I] (*ibid.*); Edward A. Wyatt, IV., *Dr. James Greenway, Eighteenth-Century Botanist, of Dinwiddie County, with an Account of two Generations of his Descendants* (Tyler's Quar. Hist. and Geneal. Mag., Apr.); Fletcher M. Green, *Duff Green: Industrial Promoter* (Jour. Southern Hist., Feb.); Leonard C. Helderman, *A Social Scientist of the Old South* (*ibid.*, May); Douglas C. McMurtrie, *A Bibliography of North Carolina Imprints, 1761-1800* [II] (North Carolina Hist. Rev., Apr.); Elizabeth H. Davidson, *The Child-Labor Problem in North*

Carolina, 1883-1903 (*ibid.*); Mabel L. Webber, *The First Governor Moore and his Children* (South Carolina Hist. and Geneal. Mag., Jan.); José Miguel Gallardo, *The Spaniards and the English Settlement in Charles Town* [cont'd] (*ibid.*, Apr.); Rogers W. Young, *The Transfer of Fort San Marcos and East Florida to the United States* (Florida Hist. Soc. Quar., Apr.); Joseph B. James, *Edmund Kirby Smith's Boyhood in Florida* (*ibid.*); H. B. Fant, *Financing the Colonization of Georgia* (Georgia Hist. Quar., Mar.); Thomas Pinckney Waring, *Savannah of the 1870's* (*ibid.*); James E. Winston, *Louisiana and the Annexation of Texas* (Louisiana Hist. Quar., Jan.); H. L. Landers, *Wet Sand and Cotton: Banks' Red River Campaign* (*ibid.*); Harold Schoen, *The Free Negro in the Republic of Texas* [I] (Southwestern Hist. Quar., Apr.); Richard R. Stenberg, *Jackson's Neches Claim, 1829-1836* (*ibid.*).

Documents: Walter J. O'Donnell, ed., *La Salle's Occupation of Texas* (Mid-America, Apr.); R. A. Lancaster, jr., ed., *Diary of Col. William Bolling of Bolling Hall* (Virginia Mag. Hist. and Biog., Apr.); James A. Padgett, ed., *Letters from Thomas Newton* [to Jefferson and Madison, 1802-1814] (William and Mary Coll. Quar., Apr.); R. H. Woody, ed., *Behind the Scenes in the Reconstruction Legislature of South Carolina: Diary of Josephus Woodruff* (Jour. Southern Hist., May); Mattie Austin Hatcher, *Letters of Antonio Martinez, the Last Spanish Governor of Texas, 1817-1822* [IV] (Southwestern Hist. Quar., Apr.).

WESTERN TERRITORIES AND STATES

The Twenty-ninth Annual Meeting of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association was held at Austin, Texas, on April 16, 17, and 18. Because of the location of the place of meeting and of the fact that this year is the one hundredth anniversary of Texan independence, the program gave special attention to problems connected with the development of the West. In a general session on "The Greater Southwest", James W. Silver presented a paper on "General Edmund P. Gaines and the Protection of the Southwestern Frontiers"; Carl C. Rister, one on "A Federal Experiment in Plains Indian Relations"; and Lewis Atherton, one on the "Santa Fe Trade during the Mexican War". Sessions were held on "Problems in Expansion", on "The South and the West in the Sixties and Seventies", on "The Trans-Mississippi West During the Civil War", and on "Recent American History". In a program on "The West in Historical Fiction", papers by E. E. Leisy, Rebecca W. Smith, and Lucy L. Hazard brought out the interrelation of history and literature. The teachers' section was devoted to the general topic of "Revision of the Content of American History Courses for High Schools", in which J. L. Sellers discussed "Slavery and the Civil War", A. B. Thomas, "The Influence of Spanish Culture in the United States", and R. N. Richardson,

"The Importance of the Great Plains in Westward Expansion". The presidential address, delivered by Professor Louis Pelzer at the annual dinner of the Association, presented a realistic view of pioneer stagecoach travel. I. J. Cox spoke at a luncheon meeting on "Revolutionary Racketeering on the Texan Frontier". At a joint dinner meeting with the Texas State Historical Association, W. C. Binkley presented an analysis of the Texan Revolution. One of the most interesting incidents of the session was a trip to San Antonio by special train and a tour of the Spanish missions and other points of historic interest in that vicinity. Edward E. Dale was elected president for 1936-1937, and the new members of the executive committee are LeRoy R. Hafen, Ruth Higgins, and Carl Wittke. W. C. B.

One of the papers published in the *Proceedings of the Seventeenth Annual Indiana History Conference,* held in December, has considerable current interest, "The Pioneer Midwest in Two Depressions", by R. C. Buley. These were the panics of 1819 and 1837.

The Iowa Department of the Grand Army of the Republic (Iowa City, State Historical Society, 1936, pp. 194), compiled by Jacob A. Swisher, includes a brief history of the department, but is mainly devoted to biographical sketches of those who have served as its commanders. Their portraits accompany the sketches.

The *Civil War Letters of Colonel Hans Christian Heg* (Northfield, Norwegian-American Historical Association, 1936, pp. ix, 260, $2.50), edited by Theodore C. Blegen, give vivid impressions of several campaigns in the western area of the Civil War, as far as Chickamauga, where Colonel Heg was mortally wounded. Dr. Blegen has prefaced the volume with a "Biographical Essay".

Pioneer Capuchin Letters [Franciscan Studies, No. 16] (Joseph F. Wagner, 1936, pp. xii, 160, $1.00), translated and edited by Theodore Roemer, O. M. Cap, Ph. D., were written for the most part by the founders of the Calvary Capuchin Province of St. Joseph, the first permanent Capuchin foundation in the United States, and cover the years 1857 to 1883.

The March number of the *Pacific Historical Review* is mainly devoted to the proceedings of the December meeting of the Pacific Coast Branch, including several of the papers presented at that time.

Articles: Merrill Jensen, *The Cession of the Old Northwest* (Miss. Valley Hist. Rev., June); Robert P. Ludlum, *Joshua R. Giddings, Radical* (*ibid.*); Louis Pelzer, *Pioneer Stage-Coach Travel* (*ibid.*); Thomas Robson Hay, *Charles Williamson and the Burr Conspiracy* (Jour. Southern Hist., May); Douglas C. McMurtrie, *Early Views of Midwestern American Cities* (Bull. Chicago Hist. Soc., Mar.); Edgar Erskine Hume, *Lafayette in Kentucky* [concl'd] (Reg. Kentucky State Hist. Soc., Apr.); Thomas F. O'Connor,

A Kentucky Contribution to Religion on the Frontier (*ibid.*); Aubrey Starke, *Books in the Wilderness* (Jour. Illinois State Hist. Soc., Jan.); Charles A. Hawley, *The Historical Background of the Attitude of the Jasper Colony toward Slavery and the Civil War* (Iowa Jour. Hist. and Pol., Apr.); Bertha M. H. Shambaugh, *Amana—In Transition* (Palimpsest, May); Robert L. Fisher, *The Western Prologue to the War of 1812* (Missouri Hist. Rev., Apr.); George B. Catlin, *Early Travel on the Ohio and its Tributaries* (Michigan Hist. Mag., spring and summer); Filip A. Forsbeck, *New Upsala: the First Swedish Settlement in Wisconsin* (Wisconsin Mag. Hist., Mar.); W. A. Titus, *The Westward Trail* [I] (*ibid.*); Laurence M. Larson, *The Kensington Rune Stone* (Minnesota Hist., Mar.); John Rossel, *The Chisholm Trail* (Kansas Hist. Quar., Feb.); Edith Walker, *Labor Problems during the first Year of Governor Martin's Administration* [1885-1886] (*ibid.*); George L. Anderson, *The El Paso Claim Club, 1859-1862* (Colorado Mag., Mar.); Douglas C. McMurtrie, *The Public Printing of the First Territorial Legislature of Colorado* (*ibid.*); Herbert O. Brayer, *Peter Heylyn's Cosmography of New Mexico* (New Mexico Hist. Rev., Apr.); France V. Scholes, *Church and State in New Mexico, 1610-1650* [cont'd] (*ibid.*); Dan W. Peery, *Oklahoma, a Foreordained Commonwealth* (Chron. Oklahoma, Mar.); Verne F. Ray, *Native Villages and Groupings of the Columbia Basin* (Pacific Northwest Quar., Apr.); Alice B. Maloney, *Hudson's Bay Company in California* (Oregon Hist. Quar., Mar.).

Documents: Jane L. Chapin, ed., *McLoughlin Letters, 1827-1849* (Oregon Hist. Quar., Mar.); Lynn I. Perrigo, ed., *Hawley's Diary of his Trip across the Plains in 1860* (Wisconsin Mag. Hist., Mar.); Cora W. Agatz, *A Journey across the Plains in 1866* (Pacific Northwest Quar., Apr.).

CANADA

General E. A. Cruikshank has continued with a second volume his edition of *The Correspondence of the Honourable Peter Russell, with Allied Documents relating to his Administration of the Government of Upper Canada during the Official Term of Lieut.-Governor J. G. Simcoe, while on Leave of Absence* (Ontario Historical Society, 1935, pp. xxvi, 351). The joint editor is A. F. Hunter. This volume covers the years 1797-1798.

A unique record of an important chapter in world settlement will be found in the publication of the series known as *Canadian Frontiers of Settlement,* edited by W. A. Mackintosh and W. L. G. Joerg (The Macmillan Company of Toronto). The nine volumes now in course of publication are the result of an effort sponsored by the American Geographical Society and the Social Science Research Council. The first volume is by the editor, Professor Mackintosh, and is entitled *Prairie Settlement: the Geographical Setting.* Among the authors of other volumes are Professors Chester Martin,

D. A. McArthur, C. A. Dawson, and H. A. Innis. Eight of the nine volumes are expected to be out by the close of the year.

Articles: George M. Wrong, *The Beginnings of Historical Criticism in Canada: a Retrospect, 1896-1936* (Canadian Hist. Rev., Mar.); Marion Gilroy, *Customs Fees in Nova Scotia* (*ibid.*); R. S. Longley, *Emigration and the Crisis of 1837 in Upper Canada* (*ibid.*); Fred Landon, *Fugitive Slaves in Ontario* (Hist. Soc. Northwestern Ohio, Quar. Bull., Apr.); Edith Dobie, *Party History in British Columbia, 1903-1933* (Pacific Northwest Quar., Apr.).

CUBA, MEXICO, AND SOUTH AMERICA

R. L. Grismer has published *A Bibliography of Articles and Essays on the Literature of Spain and Spanish America* (Minneapolis, Perine Book Company).

Mexican Claims Commissions, 1923-1934, by A. H. Feller is a useful addition to the literature concerning our relations with Mexico (Macmillan, 1935).

In *The Caribbean since 1900* (Prentice-Hall, 1936) Chester Lloyd Jones has added another to his instructive books on the Caribbean region.

S. M. Waxman has compiled *A Bibliography of the Belles-Lettres of Venezuela* (Harvard University Press, 1935).

El Gran Amanecer (Caracas, Editorial Elite, 1935) by H. Ramírez deals with the policy of the United States toward Latin America.

Among the studies that have recently appeared concerning the South American scholar Andrés Bello is one by Rafael R. Caldera entitled *Andrés Bello, Ensayo* (Caracas, Parra León Hermanos, 1935).

G. Porras Troconis presents his views on certain phases of Bolívar's career in *Gesta Bolivariana* (Caracas, Editorial Elite, 1935).

Nos. 72 and 73 of the *Boletín del Archivo Nacional* of Venezuela contains installments of the indexes of material concerning the consulate, the captaincy-general, the intendancy, and the Guipuzcoana Company.

In accordance with a law of 1935 which provided for the reorganization of the national archives of Colombia, the director of those archives has published the first number of the *Revista del Archivo Nacional* (Bogotá, 1936), which reprints constitutional documents of the revolutionary era.

Ernesto H. Celesia in *Constitución de la república del Tucumán, año 1820* prints a facsimile of that constitution (Buenos Aires, Julio Suárez, 1935).

Another work that touches the history of the Argentine frontier is by P. Grenon, S. J., with the title *Villa del Rosario: documentos para su historia* (Córdoba, 1935).

Economic problems in Brazil are treated by H. Jonen in *Die Wirtschafts- und Verkehrsprobleme im modernen Brasilien* (Berlin, 1935).

The George Washington University Press has published the lectures delivered at the Fourth Annual Seminar Conference on Hispanic Affairs held at the university last summer. The title is *Colonial Hispanic America* (pp. ix, 690) and Professor A. Curtis Wilgus the editor. Among the lecturers were Clarence F. Jones, Philip Ainsworth Means, John Tate Lanning, Alfred Hasbrouck, and the editor.

Articles: T. A. Bailey, *Interest in a Nicaragua Canal, 1903-1931* (Hispanic Am. Hist. Rev., Feb.); A. D. Bateman, *La verdadera tumba de Colón* (Bol. Hist. y Antig., Nov.); V. Lecuna, *Campaña de Bomboná* (Bol. Estud. Hist. Pasto); C. L. Mendoza, *Le junta de gobierno de Caracas de 1810* (Bol. Ac. Nac. Hist., Oct.); Madeline W. Nichols, *The Gaucho* (Pac. Hist. Rev., Mar.); J. T. Revello, *Contribución para la historia de la cultura en América en el siglo XVI* (Am. Esp., Dec.); R. Oswaldo Rivera, *El general Francisco de P. Santander: La convención de Ocaña* (Bol. Hist. y Antig., Sept.-Oct.); J. B. Scott, *The Good Neighbor Policy* (Am. Jour. Int. Law, Apr.); E. C. Stowell, *President Roosevelt's Proposal of an Extraordinary Pan American Conference* (*ibid.*).

Documents: *Documentos relacionados con la misión de Bolívar y López Méndez á Londres* (Bol. Ac. Nac. Hist., Oct.); *Documentos relacionados con la misión de Juan Vicente Bolívar y Telésforo Orea á Washington* (*ibid.*); *Testamento del señor capitán don Sebastián de Benalcázar* (Publ. Arch. Municipal, Quito, 1935).

W. S. R.

Contributions have been made to the section of Historical News by R. G. Adams, F. B. Artz, S. F. Bemis, W. C. Binkley, G. C. Boyce, P. C. Brooks, T. R. S. Broughton, E. C. Burnett, L. J. Cappon, E. N. Curtis, W. M. Daniels, W. S. Ferguson, A. Hyma, J. F. Jameson, W. T. Laprade, L. M. Larson, Eleanor Poland, W. S. Robertson, L. I. Strakhovsky, and D. H. Willson.

CORRECTION

In the April number of this journal, p. 564, the publication of *Codex quartus Sancti Iacobi*, edited by Ward Thoron, was wrongly attributed to the Mediaeval Academy of America. It was privately printed and the Academy agreed to mail review copies merely as a convenience to Mr. Thoron.

Ready soon

A Diplomatic History of the United States

By SAMUEL FLAGG BEMIS
Yale University

Early in August we shall publish a comprehensive and brilliant study of American diplomatic history, by a leading scholar in the field.

The treatment is based upon an intimate knowledge of both original and secondary sources. But it is more than an outline of facts and details: it analyzes and interprets human motives, political exigencies, and the increasing influence of economic factors.

Of special interest are the thirty-odd maps, most of them drawn for this book, and the numerous helpful charts and tables.

Politics and Government Abroad

By HENRY R. SPENCER
Ohio State University

An authoritative account of foreign governments, their organization and politics. Covers not only the countries of Europe, but Japan and Latin America as well. Gives for each country considered the historical background, governmental structure, and the parties and forces at work.

Ready in September

The Tudors

By CONYERS READ

A study of the Tudors and their important contributions to the economic, social and political life of England. $1.75

"As one would expect from Professor Read, this delightful volume combines soundness, clarity, and interest. It is certainly a valuable addition to the field."
R. G. Albion, *Princeton University*

"I am confirmed in my belief that anything written by Conyers Read in the Tudor period must be based on wide reading and careful study."
H. C. M. Wendel, *Long Island University*

★

Now Ready

Medieval Agrarian Economy

By N. NEILSON
Mount Holyoke College

A new *Berkshire Study* dealing with the agrarian organization of life in the Middle Ages. $1.00

HENRY HOLT & COMPANY 1 PARK AVENUE NEW YORK

ROBESPIERRE

By J. M. THOMPSON

"Mr. Thompson's biography of the Incorruptible would seem to render any further studies of Robespierre unnecessary. It is a great political biography which is, incidentally, a history of the French Revolution. His book is as original as it is comprehensive and spectacular."—*N. Y. Times.* 2 volumes. Illustrated. $7.00

The COMMONWEALTH of the PHILIPPINES

By GEORGE A. MALCOLM

"The former Senior Justice of the Supreme Court of the Philippines has written a definitive book on those outlying possessions. It covers every phase of their political, social and economic life. . . a mine of interesting and curious information. Particularly valuable is its description of the new government."—*Philadelphia Inquirer.* Illustrated. $5.00

MODERN GOVERNMENT

By SIR ERNEST J. P. BENN

An eminent British publicist here presents an impressive exposé of the bureaucratic mind and temper and of the results of governmental meddling. A timely analogy between the drift of modern British politics and the political trend in our country today, with government tending toward regulation of every aspect of business life to the tune of higher and higher taxes. $2.00

DISEASE and DESTINY

By RALPH H. MAJOR, M.D.

"Few books have offered so clear a picture of the role of disease in shaping the course of human events as this one. It is enlivened by graphic illustrations taken mainly from old prints."—*San Francisco Chronicle.* "Excellent reading."—*Chicago News.* With a Foreword by Dr. Logan Clendening. Illustrated. $3.50

At All Booksellers

D. APPLETON-CENTURY COMPANY

35 West 32nd Street, New York

Selected as the Best History of the Year 1935 and Awarded the

PULITZER PRIZE

A CONSTITUTIONAL HISTORY *of the* UNITED STATES

By

ANDREW C. McLAUGHLIN, PH.D.

Professor Emeritus of History
University of Chicago

Royal 8vo, 832 pp. Student's Edition, $4.00

"The book is likely to remain for many years to come a standard and authoritative treatment."—Lane W. Lancaster, University of Nebraska, in the Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science.

"As to its principal theme, the work is final."—Edward S. Corwin, Princeton University, in the American Historical Review.

"An exhibition of fine scholarship."—W. W. Willoughby in the American Bar Association Journal.

"Later writers will be Professor McLaughlin's debtors for a long time to come."—Homer C. Hockett, Ohio State University, in the Mississippi Valley Historical Review.

"A wise, succinct and well balanced treatment."—A. M. Schlesinger, Harvard University.

THE CENTURY POLITICAL SCIENCE SERIES

D. Appleton-Century Company

35 West 32nd Street
New York

2126 Prairie Avenue
Chicago

YALE

SWEDEN

THE MIDDLE WAY

By Marquis W. Childs

This national best seller has been called by Lewis Gannett "the best political news in years." "The practical solution one small country has found for distributing a better life to a greater number of people." —Sterling North in the *Chicago Daily News*. *Fifth Printing*. *Illustrated*. $2.50

ELIZABETH

Empress of Austria

By Count Egon Corti

"A biography that is both authentic and absorbing . . . Although Count Corti approaches his subject with reverence and the utmost sympathy, he is too serious a historian to let himself be carried away by his emotions."—Emil Lengyel in the *New York Times*. *Illustrated*. $4.00

SIR WALTER RALEGH

Last of the Elizabethans

By Edward Thompson

"A full detailed vivid biography of a man whose fascination is inexhaustible . . . The book is a password to a period . . . This is not only a good book; it is a very good book; it is a book that will be read and respected."—P. W. Wilson in the *New York Times*. *Illustrated*. $4.00

PAMPHLETS of the TERCENTENARY COMMISSION of the STATE of CONNECTICUT

This series, dealing with various phases of Connecticut life and thought, has now been completed with the publication of sixty pamphlets. A pamphlet giving complete information concerning the series and its contributors may be obtained free of charge from the Yale University Press. Separate pamphlets list at 25c, 50c and 75c. Complete set of Sixty Pamphlets. $16.00

THE CANADIAN COMMERCIAL REVOLUTION, 1845-1851*

By Gilbert Norman Tucker

This volume examines the economic background of an interesting and critical period in the history of the British Empire and of Canada. $3.00

THE COMMERCE OF NORTH CAROLINA, 1763-1789*

By Charles Christopher Crittenden

This is a study of the economic and social phases of a period of conflict and transition in the history of North Carolina. $2.50

*A Yale Historical Publication

YALE UNIVERSITY PRESS: *New Haven, Conn.*

Reissued . . . .

The Populist Revolt

A HISTORY OF THE FARMERS' ALLIANCE AND THE PEOPLE'S PARTY

By **JOHN D. HICKS,** ***Professor of American History, University of Wisconsin***

"A thorough, scholarly, sympathetic, and spirited history of the entire Populist movement."—Henry S. Commager in *Herald Tribune Books.*

"Far and away the best account of Populism that we have and one not likely to be replaced . . . discriminating . . . judicious."—William MacDonald in the *New York Times.*

"A contribution of the first importance to the understanding of our current problems."—David S. Muzzey in the *American Observer.*

"Needs to be read wherever one studies the politics and the economics of the United States."—Frederic L. Paxson, in the *Annals.* Illus. $4.00.

Other Timely Books . . . .

John Lind of Minnesota

By **GEORGE M. STEPHENSON,** ***Professor of History, University of Minnesota***

This biography of Minnesota's Fusion (Populist-Democratic) governor lights up the political background of the present Farmer-Labor movement, as well as telling for the first time the "inside story" of President Wilson's Mexican policy of 1913–15. Illus. $4.00.

The British Way to Recovery

By **HERBERT HEATON,** ***Professor of Economic History, University of Minnesota***

The London *Economic Journal* calls this "an extremely lucid, readable, and acute summary" of depression-fighting by the British peoples. $2.00.

Dictatorship in the Modern World

Edited by **DEAN GUY STANTON FORD**

Interpretations of history in the making by Max Lerner of *The Nation,* Lutz of Stanford, Rippy of Duke, Spencer of Ohio State, Deutsch of Minnesota, Kohn of Smith, and Brogan of Oxford. $2.50.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA PRESS, Minneapolis

For College Classes • •

Carman's
SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES

Vol. I. From Handicraft to Factory, 1500-1820. 628p. $4.00

Vol. II. The Rise of Industrialism, 1820-1875. 694p. $4.00

Carman and McKee's
A HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES

Vol. I. Foundations, Expansion, Conflict, 1492-1865. 916p. $3.60.

Interesting in presentation, accurate in detail, with ample consideration of the social, economic, political, and cultural aspects of American life.

• D. C. HEATH AND COMPANY

Boston New York Chicago Atlanta San Francisco Dallas London

ANNOUNCING

TOPICAL ANALYSIS OF
COMPARATIVE EUROPEAN GOVERNMENTS
(with charts and tables)

By J. R. Starr, University of Minnesota

The essential facts presented in an outline form which has been carefully developed in the classroom. Reference readings are included. For further information write to the nearest office of the publishers.

Ready for the opening of college in the fall

Boston New York Chicago Atlanta Dallas Columbus San Francisco

GINN AND COMPANY

At last—

An ancient history textbook which is *balanced*, *inexpensive*, and *readable*.

History of Ancient Civilization

VOLUME I

by ALBERT A. TREVER, *Lawrence College*

Volume I, covering the Ancient Near East and Greece, was published last May. Indications are that it will be used in at least 100 colleges by October.

1. It is the clearest, most up-to-date one-volume synthesis of our present-day knowledge of ancient times.
2. It gives the most adequate coverage of Pre-Hellenistic history in any college text.
3. It successfully adapts the concepts of the "new history" to the study of classical civilization.
4. Its style and presentation catch, hold, and GUIDE the student's interest.

585 pages *62 illustrations* *$3.50*

Volume II, on Rome, will be published next spring.

HARCOURT, BRACE AND COMPANY
NEW YORK

NEW HISTORIES

for college classes

Vlachos HELLAS AND HELLENISM

"In his vivid presentation Dr. Vlachos makes the Greek world reasonable and human." This skillfully coördinated history of Greek civilization presents Greek politics, religion, education, art, and philosophy as closely related aspects of a consistent whole. 428 pages. $3.00 subject to discount.

Steiger A HISTORY OF THE FAR EAST

"A very readable and understandable account of the history of Eastern and Southern Asia," writes Cyrus H. Peake in the *Annals* of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. This comprehensive new history covers all the countries of southeastern Asia from the beginnings of their history to the present. 928 pages. $4.75, subject to discount.

Collins A HISTORY OF MEDIEVAL CIVILIZATION

Experience in teaching, careful research and close observation of findings made by specialists in particular fields have enabled Professor Collins to present an accurate history of medieval civilization for first and second-year college students. 800 pages. $3.50, subject to discount.

GINN AND COMPANY

Boston *New York* *Chicago* *Atlanta*

Dallas *Columbus* *San Francisco*

THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

Founded in 1884 Chartered by Congress in 1889

Principal Office

40 INDEPENDENCE AVE., S. W., WASHINGTON, D. C.

MEMBERSHIP, DECEMBER, 1935: Life members, 527; annual members, 2179; institutions, 330; total, 3036. Persons interested in historical studies, whether professionally or otherwise, are invited to membership.

MEETINGS: An annual meeting is held in the last days of each year. The program of papers presented and the business meeting occupy three days. The average attendance exceeds 500.

The Association maintains close relations with the state and local historical societies through conferences in connection with the annual meetings.

The Pacific Coast Branch holds meetings in December on the Pacific Coast. Full membership in the Association is maintained.

PUBLICATIONS: The *Annual Report,* covering the activities of the Association, and a supplementary volume or volumes of importance to students of history are printed by virtue of an appropriation by Congress, and are sent to members who request them.

The *American Historical Review*, surveying the entire field of Ancient, Medieval, and Modern, including American, history, published quarterly, is sent to all members.

PRIZES: The *John H. Dunning Prize,* of $200, is awarded for a work on a subject in the field of American history.

The *George Louis Beer Prize,* of about $240 (the income from the prize fund), is awarded for the best work upon any phase of European international history since 1895.

The *Jean Jules Jusserand Medal* is offered annually for the best work on intellectual relations between America and one or more European countries.

DUES: The annual dues are $5.00; there is no initiation fee. The fee for life membership, $100, secures exemption from all annual dues.

CORRESPONDENCE: Inquiries respecting the Association should be addressed to the Assistant Secretary at 40 Independence Ave., S. W., Washington, D. C.

A REVISED EDITION OF

EUROPE SINCE 1914

By F. Lee Benns

READY SEPTEMBER 1st—This thorough revision covers recent developments to July, 1936, and improves in several important respects the book's organization for teaching purposes. A new chapter, "The Unsolved Problem of Disarmament," traces the post-war efforts and the failure to limit armaments. "The Continued Search for National Security" outlines the diplomacy of the powers from the Peace Conference to the present. Another chapter, "Poland and the Baltic Republics," surveys the history of Poland, Danzig, Lithuania, Vilna and Memel, Estonia and Latvia, and Finland. The international crisis provoked by the Italo-Ethiopian conflict is traced in this edition with the same skill that was shown in the treatment of the Sino-Japanese conflict in the revised edition. New maps and illustions have been added.

Ready for September classes. Write now to

F. S. CROFTS & CO.
NEW YORK

Announcing a New Columbia Book

A Guide to the General Cahiers of 1789

By

Beatrice Fry Hyslop

The author of *French Nationalism in 1789 According to the General Cahiers* has prepared a valuable new book of related interest. *A Guide to the General Cahiers* removes the obstacles in the path of the scholarly use of these documents. A concise, convenient table of the cahiers is included. Two-thirds of the volume is devoted to the reprinting of 34 cahiers not hitherto available except in manuscript. This definitive guide is now ready.

The price is $5.00. Order from

Box A871

Columbia University Press

2960 Broadway, New York City

OUT-OF-PRINT BOOKS

I specialize in the search for and quotation of desired books. All possible speed, best possible prices; no obligation. A stock of scholarly books on hand. Publications of the learned societies available. Most current books, wherever published, 10% off list.

Eugene Thumim
245 Fort Washington Avenue
New York City. (WA-7-2487)

For the Observer of World Affairs—

ON THE RIM OF THE ABYSS

JAMES T. SHOTWELL

A noted historian examines the various crises which have brought today's imbroglio, and suggests a reorganized League of Nations. $3.00

The Macmillan Company

60 Fifth Ave. New York

"The most satisfactory, most convincing, most powerful presentation of the Civil War and Reconstruction ever put into fiction!"

—*Los Angeles Times*

GONE WITH THE WIND

by Margaret Mitchell

"Never have the two periods been treated with a fuller, more comprehensive understanding. In historical background as well as character treatment, a very noteworthy achievement."—*Boston Transcript.*

"The book is absorbing. It is a fearless portrayal, romantic yet not sentimental, of a lost tradition and a way of life."—ELLEN GLASGOW.

"This book has been waiting to be written for many years."—HENRY SEIDEL CANBY.

1037 pages . $3.00

Charles Coulson Rich

by

John Henry Evans

Sixty years of frontier life and Mormon history march before the reader in vivid detail in pages of this fascinating biographical study. $3.50

Andrew Johnson

by

Lloyd Paul Stryker

"Not merely a biography of Johnson; rather a complete portrayal of the man in his relation to the times."—*New York Times.* $5.00

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY NEW YORK